The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment

A Report to the Librarian of Congress
by the
Director of the Processing Department

The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment

A Report to the Librarian of Congress
by the
Director of the Processing Department

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON : 1960

L. C. Card 60–60033

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	v
Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	xi
Part I. The Experiment from the Viewpoint of the Library of Congress	1
The Cataloging Phase	3
Publisher Experience and Attitude	23
Final Considerations	41
Part II. The Experiment from the Viewpoint of the Consumer	53
Report of the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey	55
Report of the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee	97
Appendixes	101

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/cataloginginsour00libr

PREFACE

This report describes an experiment which was made possible through a generous grant to the Library of Congress by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. In accepting the grant the Library also accepted the responsibility for directing and conducting the experiment. This responsibility extends to interpretation of the results. The contributions made by the American Library Association's Cataloging Policy and Research Committee and by the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey are gratefully acknowledged but the Library of Congress accepts the full responsibility for the interpretation here presented.

The immediate purpose of the experiment was to test once more, under modern conditions, the feasibility of a proposal which was first advanced, and tested, during the 1870's and 1880's. The present-day phase of the proposal, denominated as "Cataloging-in-Source," envisaged the printing by publishers in their current publications of facsimiles of Library of Congress cards. This would be made possible by having the Library of Congress catalog these titles in advance of publication from page proofs and data sheets supplied by the publishers. The underlying concept was that all books could be cataloged once and for all at some central point by standardized methods and that libraries would transfer the catalog entries by means of a "cataloger's camera" from the books themselves to cards which they would then file in their card catalogs.

The experiment approached the basic problem from two angles. One was concerned with the financial and technical problems involved and the practicability of the proposal from the viewpoints of the publishers and the Library of Congress. The other was concerned with the actual use which libraries and other "consumers" might make of the catalog entries appearing in the publications they acquired.

The Library of Congress welcomed the opportunity to cooperate with publishers and with other libraries in determining whether an experiment which had been tried unsuccessfully during the nineteenth century could be made to succeed in the twentieth century. The experiment was carried out as planned. With the cooperation of 157 publishing concerns and Government agencies the Library during the experimental period gave Cataloging-in-Source treatment to 1,203 publications, 203 more than the

original goal of 1,000 titles. Under what was termed the "Consumer Reaction Survey" of the project, more than 200 representative libraries, after filling out questionnaires, were visited by trained investigators and their reactions to Cataloging-in-Source were ascertained. The experiment may be said to have proved three things. First, that it is possible for the Library of Congress to catalog some books from page proofs before they are published with distinct limitations described below. Second, that it is possible for a selected number of publishers to print Library of Congress catalog entries in a considerable number of their publications. Third, that a representative group of libraries would welcome the presence of cataloging information in the titles they acquire.

The underlying purpose of the experiment, however, was to ascertain whether a permanent, full-scale program of Cataloging-in-Source could be justified in terms of financing, technical considerations, and utility. As regards this, the answer must be a regretful negative. The reasons for this decision are spelled out in Part I of this report and particularly in the section entitled "Final Considerations." Here the major determining factors will only be mentioned. They are chiefly the very high cost of the proposed program to both publishers and the Library of Congress, disruptions of publishing schedules, the high degree of unreliability of catalog entries based on texts not in their final form, and the low degree of utility which would result from the copying of these entries, because of the variations in their format as printed, their unreliability, and the need for adapting them to the requirements of individual libraries. The reader is referred to the body of this report for an elucidation of these points.

The suggestion that Cataloging-in-Source information in books be limited to the main entry, subject entries, and classification indicia meets some of the above-mentioned objections but it would employ an elaborate machinery to obtain a minimal result. The problems of cost and of interrupted production schedules would largely remain, along with numerous related problems mentioned in the final section of Part I of

this report. I am compelled to the conclusion that a modified Cataloging-in-Source program could not be justified in terms of utility versus cost and that the Library of Congress should not seek funds for a further experiment along these lines. I am also of the opinion that more economical methods can be found to achieve results which will meet the needs of the great majority of American libraries. In this connection the concluding pages of Part I, on possible alternatives, should be consulted.

The Library of Congress is grateful for the opportunity afforded it by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. to conduct this experiment. I believe that the results have been beneficial and that the report which follows will justify careful reading by librarians, publishers, and all those working in allied fields. The Cataloging-in-Source experiment has made an important contribution to the search for a better method of making cataloging information available economically and expeditiously.

L. Quincy Mumford
Librarian of Congress

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This experiment could not have been executed without the cooperation of a large number of publishers and librarians who assisted the Library of Congress at every stage of the project. Andrew D. Osborn, then Assistant Librarian of Harvard University, carried out the preliminary survey which encouraged the Library of Congress to undertake the testing of the concept of Cataloging-in-Source. Dan Lacy, Managing Director of the American Book Publishers Council, Inc., was of great assistance in suggesting publishers who might be willing to participate in the experiment. George W. Schwegmann, Jr., Chief of the Library's Union Catalog Division, and Alpheus L. Walter, Chief of the Card Division, performed yeoman service in the actual work of visiting publishers and eliciting their cooperation.

In the cataloging phase of the project at the Library of Congress itself, C. Sumner Spalding, Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, and Barbara P. Andrews, Administrative Assistant, Descriptive Cataloging Division, were chiefly responsible for a performance which substantially exceeded the original goal of 1,000 titles. One hundred titles were cataloged by the U. S. Department of Agriculture Library through the cooperation of Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director, and under the direction of Bella E. Shachtman, Chief, Catalog and Records Section of that library.

In the Consumer Reaction Survey stage of the experiment the Library had the advice and assistance of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee of the American Library Association whose present members are Katharine L. Ball of the University of Toronto Library School; Margaret W. Ayrault of the University of Michigan Library; Margaret C. Brown of the Free Library of Philadelphia; Jennette E. Hitchcock of the Stanford University Library; and Paul E. Kebabian of the New York Public Library. Miss Shachtman served as consultant to the Committee and its successive chairmen, during the course of the experiment, have been Miss Shachtman, Miss Brown, and Miss Ball. The Committee devoted a great deal of time and thought to guiding the course of the survey and to studying its findings. Esther J. Piercy of the Enoch Pratt Free Public Library, as the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey,

executed a difficult and onerous assignment with great success. She was assisted by a very able and hard-working group of interviewers: Eleanor E. Campion of the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalogue; Virginia Drewry of the Georgia State Department of Education; Richard L. Pautzsch of the Brooklyn Public Library; and Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. of the Yale University Library. A list of the libraries taking part in the Consumer Reaction Survey appears as appendix H. Thomas R. Barcus, Technical Officer, Processing Department, was largely responsible for the drafting of the Introduction and Part I of this report.

INTRODUCTION

In May 1958 the Library of Congress accepted a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. to experiment with "Cataloging-in-Source," i.e., cataloging books before they are published (from page proofs) and having the publishers print the catalog entries in the books themselves.

The Historical Background

The parent concept of centralized cataloging is, of course, an old one. The Athenaeum of May 11, 1850 (pp.499-502) reviews the report of the Royal commission on the British Museum and suggests that Panizzi proceed not only with his catalog of the Museum's own holdings but also, on the same uniform system, with a catalog of all works published in the English language or printed in Great Britain and its colonies, but not then in the British Museum. The reviewer particularly commends a suggestion by William D. Cooley, the geographer, regarding the stereotyping of individual titles and adds "Perhaps the best plan would be if means can be devised to avoid the fruitless reduplication of titles, that each government should print its own catalogue, and each exchange with the others, stereotyped titles."

In August of the same year Charles C. Jewett, Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution, communicated a more detailed plan along the same lines to the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its meeting in New Haven (The Association's Proceedings, vol. 4, pp. 165-176). His proposal called for printing a catalog by stereotyping the titles separately and preserving the blocks or plates in alphabetical order to permit insertions, the object being a general catalog of American libraries.

An alternative method was suggested by Albert Blor, a Dublin scholar, in the May 21, 1853 issue of Notes and Queries (p. 507). In a letter to the editor, he wrote: "May not photography be usefully applied to the making of catalogues of large libraries"? He went on to suggest that librarians should replace the laborious transcription and cross-indexing of titles with a file-sized photographic copy of the title page of each volume, from which five prints could be made for cross-indexing purposes.

A closer approach to the specific concept of "Cataloging-in-Source" was made by Professor Max Müller, the Orientalist and quondam Curator of the Bodleian Library. In an anonymous contribution to the March 18, 1876 issue of The Academy he speaks of the waste involved when a hundred libraries each catalog the same book and recommends that the cataloging slips be printed and exchanged between libraries, particularly the national libraries of Europe, each being responsible for its own national book production. As an alternative he suggests "There are, of course, other ways in which the same object might be obtained, if only the principal libraries would agree on a common line of action. Each author might be requested to write a proper slip of his own book, and the publisher might forward copies of these slips with the book itself."

The First Experiment

The proposal that the cataloging information be actually printed in the book was seemingly first advanced in the 1870's, a period when librarians, then as now, were increasingly concerned with the high cost of cataloging. The initial suggestion was apparently made in the early months of 1876 by Justin Winsor, distinguished historian and Librarian of Harvard College. It was adopted with enthusiasm by R. R. Bowker, editor of the Publishers' Weekly. In an editorial in the April 1 issue (vol. 9, p.434) he wrote:

> "Mr. Justin Winsor, whose practical experience in the management of the Boston Library should give his opinion the greatest weight with the trade, makes to us the practical suggestion that publishers should insert in the books they send out a bibliographical record of the title, etc., on uniform-sized slips of stiff paper. These would serve the triple purpose of a registry for editors, libraries, and book sellers, and would be of the greatest convenience to all these classes; or this record might be printed at the top of a sheet, the lower part of which

should be filled with advertisements of forthcoming publications, or, still better, with a clear summary of the contents of the book, for the information of the bookseller in selling the book, and of the editor who has time to notice it but briefly. Such slips would take the place of the present advertising, editorial and other inserts, and would be of tenfold value. We propose to follow this suggestion up, and shall possibly present to the trade later a suggestion of the form, etc., of such an insert." (See appendix A for a sample sheet of "Slips for Librarians to paste on Catalogue Cards." This sheet was bound by the publisher into a book published during the period of the first experiment.)

C. A. Nelson, later Deputy Librarian of Columbia University, repeated the suggestion in the first issue (September 30, 1876, p. 15) of the Library Journal which was published with R. R. Bowker as General Editor, Melvil Dewey as Managing Editor, and Mr. Winsor as the most prominent of the Associate Editors. Mr. Nelson refers to the editorial in the Publishers' Weekly and adds:

> "With each book published there should be sent out prepared slips containing the author's name and the title-page in full, carefully arranged as they are on the general 'card catalogues' of our best libraries. The slips may be of good thin paper, and a trifle smaller in dimensions than the cards used in libraries. When a book thus catalogued is added to a library, the librarian can paste the slip upon one of his cards and place it at once in the 'card catalogue.' The subject or subjects treated of in the book may be written upon similar cards mounted with extra slips, on the margin above the slip, these latter cards to be placed in the 'card index of subjects.'

> ...If the publishers are willing, the preparation of the slips might be assigned to the Library Journal or the Publishers' Weekly, thereby securing the desired uniformity, copies of books or title-pages and contents being all sent to the 'cataloguer.'
>
> These slips would be of use not only in large libraries, but in all. Many private individuals would thus be able to have catalogues of their libraries..."

The suggestion is commended in an editorial on page 14 of the same issue and the editors promise that "We shall return to it again." This promise was kept in the following year when the Library Journal (vol. 2, pp. 32-33) reported the proceedings of the second annual conference of the American Library Association (New York, 1877). Mr. Winsor, president of the Association that year, presented the topic and suggested that the "publishers' slip" should be "of commercial-note size, divided into four parts, each the size of the uniform catalogue card, and containing the title under the several entries which were desirable." Later developments make it clear that he had in mind an author entry, a title entry, and two subject entries. Mr. Bowker commended the suggestion but warned that "The difficulty in regard to obtaining the cooperation of the book trade would be, that publishing books is a business and not philanthropy... . They desire to see that there is money in it." F. W. Christern, a bookseller, added a note from his experience with private collectors, and Melvil Dewey mentioned that Italian publishers were currently sending out printed slips with each of their new books. The discussion ended with the appointment of Messrs. Winsor, Bowker, and Dewey as a Committee on Publishers' Title-Slips.

The Committee's first report appears in the Library Journal of May 1878 (pp. 113-115). It recommended: "(1) ... preparing a uniform title-entry, with headings and note, to be furnished to publishers for use in advertising circulars, catalogues, etc., and to journals desiring to use them for book-lists; (2) for furnishing to subscribers title-slips so prepared in shape for

immediate use as catalogue cards." The slip was to consist of three parts: "(1) the headings... including title-heading, if any, subject-headings in order of importance, and class numbers in decimal system... (2) The author's name... followed ... by the title-entry... according to the rules of the Committee on Uniform Title-Entries... (3) The note... descriptive and explanatory." Two sample slips were reproduced. (See appendix B)

The Committee proposed "to make the New York office of the Library Journal and Publishers' Weekly a central office for library as well as book-trade record, but these title-slips will be prepared under the directing supervision of the librarians of Harvard and the Boston Athenaeum. It is thought essential, both to assure uniformity and to provide that the notes shall be purely descriptive, to have all the slips prepared at some one office of record, under authoritative direction. Publishers will be asked to forward to the office designated the first procurable sheets or an advance copy of each book. The headings, title, and imprint and notes will be at once prepared, revised, put in type, and an electro furnished to the publisher in time for use at the head of the flying-sheets usually inserted in books issued, as well as for future use in catalogues. From this plate is to be printed on stiff paper the catalogue slip, which is mailed to every library and individual subscribing. Ultimately the slips may be included in the bibliographical lists of the Publishers' Weekly and the Library Journal. Having a plate of full title, imprints, heading, and notes all prepared by library authorities, will secure frequent printings in class lists, summaries, bulletins, etc., for the expense, delay of proof-reading, and danger of mistakes are avoided. The supervisory labor will be given, but the publisher will be asked to pay the necessary expenses. For the present the cost is estimated at $1.00 per book... The Committee would emphasize to publishers the advertising value of issuing with each book such a slip-circular headed with this title and note. It would be used as a catalogue card by libraries, and individuals, and by the bookseller to keep at the service of his customers invaluable card catalogues... As soon as the development of the system justifies, it is proposed to mail the slips in weekly packets to all subscribers, or even more frequently if found necessary."

At the 1879 annual conference of the American Library Association in Boston R. R. Bowker reported for the Committee (Library Journal vol. 4, p.291) as follows:

> "The first plan of the Committee... proved impracticable, partly because all libraries do not use the standard card, so that some called for an edition on thin slips for pasting, and partly because in handling so many individual slips the minute items of cost for each one would sum up to a total cost which could not be covered.
>
> The present system of the 'Title-slip registry,' which is sent as a supplement with each copy of the Library Journal, as well as to individual subscribers, was devised to meet the practical difficulty of cost. The first cost of making the title-entries, according to the rules of the Library Association, of furnishing the notes, and of setting the type, is borne by the Publishers' Weekly, which has adopted this system for its weekly record of books. Proofs are then sent to Mr. Cutter and Mr. Dewey at Boston, who mark on books registered the proper headings and decimal numbers. To those publishers who desire to have their books treated in this way, a fee of $1 per work is charged, for which an electrotype of the title-slip is furnished to them. Thirteen of the leading publishers agreed to this arrangement, but some are even now not disposed to keep it up. Despite the fact that the system costs only for paper, printing and postage, these fees and the few individual subscribers have not, so far, been sufficient to make both ends meet."

The March 15, 1879 Publishers' Weekly (p.304) announced the mailing of the January and February 1879 issues of the Title-Slip Registry printed one one side only of thin paper, intended for pasting on catalog cards. Publication was planned for the

last of each month and subscriptions were set at $1 per year. At the end of 1879 the title of this publication was changed to the Book Registry and the price reduced to 25¢ a year (Publishers' Weekly, vol. 16, p.880). The monthly issues for that year were also bound together in manila covers and offered at 75¢. The program failed, however, to win a sufficient response and its discontinuance was announced in the Publishers' Weekly of February 21, 1880 (p. 196). Nevertheless, at least one publisher, Henry Holt and Company, continued until 1883 to print in selected publications a removable page containing catalog entries. Dissertations on Early Law and Custom by Sir Henry Sumner Maine and Lectures on Preaching by Ezekiel Gilman Robinson, appearing in that year, each contained a page with four entries: author, title, and two subjects, as originally suggested by Justin Winsor. The practice then seems to have lapsed.

Later Developments

But the idea remained alive and sporadic efforts were made over the next three-quarters of a century to put it into execution. When the Library of Congress launched its printed catalog card service in 1901, it was immediately suggested that a catalog card should be distributed with each new book sold and this suggestion has been repeated at frequent intervals to the present day. Some efforts were actually made during the years along this line, chiefly in connection with projects financed by grants from foundations. The most extensive effort of this sort took place during the years 1929-1938 in connection with the series of grants, totaling $1,000,000, by the Carnegie Corporation to the libraries of 81 American colleges. The Corporation, in placing orders with a wholesaler for titles selected by these libraries, included in the requisition an order for Library of Congress cards for each title. As recently as 1957 the Carnegie Corporation, under its "Carnegie Book Shelf Project," financed for overseas distribution the purchase of 250 sets of cards for each of 350 titles. Individual publishers have also, from time to time, ordered Library of Congress cards in thousands of copies for a particular title and included them in their shipments to purchasers. The same practical considerations, however, militated against this second experiment, as did also the fact that cards could not be prepared by the Library of Congress until after the books had been published and received in the Library. For

several years during the past decade the Melbourne firm of F. W. Cheshire & Company reproduced in some of its books catalog cards prepared by the University of Melbourne. There have been similar attempts in New Zealand and Brazil, and in the USSR many publications contain cataloging data in the form of a colophon. A few agencies of the U. S. Government, among them the Bureau of the Census, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the Tariff Commission, have in recent years printed identification statements in certain of their issuances.

The Second Experiment

Reawakened interest in the basic concept led in January 1958 to an initial grant by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. to the Library of Congress. Under this grant Andrew D. Osborn, then Assistant Librarian of Harvard University, during that month explored with publishers and librarians some of the problems involved. His report indicated a favorable response on the part of those consulted and he recommended a pilot project to test the feasibility of Cataloging-in-Source. Dr. Osborn's recommendations were accepted and the Council made available the sum of $55,000 for a 1-year experiment in prepublication cataloging.

The experiment was to have two principal purposes. The first was to test the financial and technical problems involved in cataloging from final page proof and to discover whether such cataloging was feasible from the point of view of the publishers and the Library of Congress by cataloging 1,000 titles from presses of various sizes and types. The Library of Congress agreed to catalog each publication and to supply the publishers with printer's copy for a complete cataloging entry. Under the plan, the publishers were to print this entry in the finished book--on the verso of the title page, in the colophon, or in some other convenient place.

The second purpose was to ascertain "consumer reaction," primarily the use libraries of various sizes and degrees of specialization would make of the catalog entry appearing in the publications they acquired. The ALA's Cataloging Policy and Research Committee offered to serve as

an advisory body to a field staff assigned to investigate these effects in terms of the purchase of catalog cards, the cost of cataloging, the speed with which publications were processed for use, and the methods used to transfer catalog entries from books to card catalogs. The emphasis throughout the experiment was to be on determining as precisely as possible the conditions which would be required for the successful operation of Cataloging-in-Source.

Publisher Reaction

The early months of the project were devoted to efforts to secure the cooperation of publishers. In these efforts Dan Lacy, Managing Director of the American Book Publishers Council, Inc., acting in an unofficial capacity, was of the greatest assistance in suggesting firms that might be approached and in other ways. During the period from June through September 1958 members of the Library's staff visited over 300 publishers, including commercial firms, university presses, Federal and State agencies, and associations, located in 40 cities in 21 States and the District of Columbia. (See appendix C.) The response varied widely. Some publishers willingly agreed to participate fully in the experiment, others were dubious and agreed to only a limited and conditional participation, and a considerable number, though sympathetic to the needs of libraries, were unable to participate because of technical difficulties. Some of these difficulties are illustrated by the following representative quotations from letters received.

One of the largest of the trade publishers, who had originally agreed to take part in the project, wrote later: "We have now had an opportunity to investigate in detail exactly what participation in the program would mean, in the light of our own publishing program and facilities. The results, I'm sorry to say, indicate that we should not participate at the present time. Fully appreciating the end you want to accomplish and being sympathetic to it, we nevertheless now know that to conduct the procedures which would be required by the initial experimentation in the program would seriously affect our own publishing program. Because of the fact that we have a record publishing list, in quantity, coming up in the next few seasons, with crowded schedules and enormous strains on our production

facilities, we feel that participation in the program would impose serious obstacles to meeting our already heavy commitments." Another leading trade publisher believed that the presence of the catalog entry would detract from the esthetic appearance of his books. He added: "I had certain reservations about the cost and efficiency of this program. Since then I have heard considerable unfavorable comments and I feel that my attitude is now completely unsympathetic." One important publisher was willing to forward page proofs only if he were reimbursed for the cost of printing and mailing them and a number of other publishers made the same suggestion. A very large trade publisher, in declining to participate, mentioned not only the factor of cost but also that of disrupted schedules. This was a frequent reaction.

Difficulties of another type are illustrated by the situation encountered in the capital of a major State. The State itself was found to do very little printing, its needs being taken care of by from 10 to 12 printing establishments both within and outside the State. These establishments operate on a bid and contract basis and the successful bidders change from year to year. The difficulties here proved to be insurmountable.

In the end, a total of 244 publishers of varying types agreed to participate in the experiment but only 157 of these had actually forwarded publications for cataloging when the project ended. Some firms sent only a few selected titles, others cooperated to the full extent of their production during the experimental period. A list of the cooperating publishers is contained in appendix F, table 1.

Cataloging began in July 1958 with the processing of 25 titles from 8 publishers and reached its peak in January 1959 with the processing of 233 titles from 86 publishers. By the end of January 1959 the stipulated 1,000 titles had been cataloged but proof sheets continued to be received for some weeks following that date and when this phase of the project was formally concluded in February 1959 the cataloging of 1,203 publications had been completed. This phase of the experiment is described in detail in part 1 of this report. One hundred titles were cataloged by the Department of Agriculture Library under cooperative arrangements.

In February 1959 letters were sent to all publishers who had participated in the experiment, inviting an expression of opinion on the arrangements which had been made, difficulties encountered, and costs incurred. The replies received are analyzed in part I.

In May 1959 members of the Library of Congress staff met in New York City with a representative group of publishers to discuss a number of problems encountered during the course of the experiment and to consider possible solutions. These discussions are summarized in part I of this report.

The Consumer Reaction Survey

In September 1958 Esther J. Piercy, Chief of the Processing Division of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, was appointed director of a "Consumer Reaction Survey" to ascertain the use libraries might make of the catalog entries appearing in the publications they acquired. The survey was begun at the end of October 1958 when its director met in Washington with the Director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress and the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. At this meeting it was decided to send interviewers to approximately 200 representative libraries. In preparation for the interview it was further decided to send a questionnaire indicating the information which should be assembled in anticipation of the visit and a tentative outline of the questionnaire was prepared.

The director of the survey visited the Library of Congress Processing Department, the H. W. Wilson Company in New York, and the Bro-Dart Industries in Newark to gather background information, then prepared a preliminary draft of a questionnaire --the first of four preliminary drafts. In November 1958 each member of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee tried out the second of these drafts in her own and in one other library. This draft was also studied by, and considerably revised as a result of the suggestions made by, Maurice F. Tauber of the Columbia University School of Library Service and Carlyle F. Frarey of the University of North Carolina School of Library Science.

Meanwhile, the team of interviewers had been appointed: Eleanor E. Campion, Director of the Philadelphia Bibliographical

Center and Union Library Catalogue; Virginia Drewry, Library Consultant, Georgia State Department of Education; Richard O. Pautzsch, Coordinator of Cataloging, Brooklyn Public Library; and Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Assistant Head, Catalogue Department, Yale University Library. This group met with the Director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress and the survey director at the Library of Congress in mid-January 1959, making changes (principally cuts) in the third draft of the questionnaire, making a final selection of the libraries to be asked to cooperate, and outlining the itineraries for the five interviewers.

At the Midwinter conference of the American Library Association in Chicago at the end of January 1959, the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey met on three occasions with the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. The Committee approved the last draft of the questionnaire (renamed "Information to be Assembled") and the plans which had been made. During the conference the Director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, members of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee, and the survey director also met with the Administrators of Technical Services of Large Research Libraries group, discussing the project with them. By invitation, the Chairman of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee and the survey director likewise attended the meeting of the Program Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division where plans were completed for the program on Cataloging-in-Source at the Annual conference in Washington.

In February 1959 letters were sent to 185 libraries asking them to cooperate in the Consumer Reaction Survey and questionnaires were mailed to those accepting. In April 1959 the staff of the survey began a series of visits to 200 selected libraries (public, college and university, school, and special) which by the end of May had taken them to 38 States and the District of Columbia. Their findings are described in the report of the director of the survey and a list of the libraries visited appears as appendix H.

In a related effort, a publicity release containing information on Cataloging-in-Source and requesting comments and

suggestions, was sent to library publications, both national and State, and was widely printed. At the same time, the project was called to the attention of regional groups of catalogers or technical services personnel customarily holding spring meetings and arrangements were made for members of the survey group or of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee to participate in 12 programs on Cataloging-in-Source. In addition, plans were made for 4 meetings on this topic in the fall of 1959. As a result of these activities and of accounts carried in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin and in Cataloging Service, 200 letters concerning the experiment were received by the survey director. Some of the cooperating publishers and the Library of Congress also received a number of comments.

The personnel of the Consumer Reaction Survey met in Washington on two occasions during June 1959 with representatives of the Library of Congress and with the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee to exchange information and impressions and to lay plans for the final stages of the project. Preliminary reports were made to the American Library Association at its Annual conference in Washington in June 1959 by C. Sumner Spalding, Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, on the experiment from the viewpoint of the Library of Congress; by Roy B. Eastin, Executive Officer of the Government Printing Office, on the experiment from the viewpoint of the publishers; and by Virginia Drewry on the Consumer Reaction Survey. These reports are printed in the Fall 1959 issue of Library Resources and Technical Services (pp. 239-256).

During the latter part of the summer of 1959 the interviewers sorted the questionnaires and the letters received by type of library, and 4 of them abstracted the information considered necessary for the final report, each working in his field of specialization: Miss Campion, special libraries, (including specialized colleges such as schools of mines or theology); Miss Drewry, school libraries (both individual schools and school systems with centralized processing); Mr. Pautzsch, public libraries (including State libraries and regional centers); and Mr. Treyz, college, university, and research libraries. With the aid of this data, the survey director prepared the final report which was reviewed at a

meeting in Washington in October 1959 by the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. Some revisions and rearrangement of the material were indicated and the Committee also prepared a draft of its recommendations to the Librarian of Congress. The revised report on the Consumer Reaction Survey was completed in December 1959 and in February 1960 the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee submitted its recommendations to the Librarian of Congress.

PART I

THE EXPERIMENT FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE CATALOGING PHASE

Working Arrangements with Publishers

When members of the Library's staff visited publishers during the early summer of 1958 they explained the basic operation of forwarding proofs to the Library of Congress and having them returned with catalog copy but the details involved had to be worked out and it was not until mid-August that the Library began the mailing to participating publishers of instruction sheets, special delivery mailing labels, data sheets for both letterpress and offset reprints, and sample Cataloging-in-Source entries in varying styles.

The instruction sheets were designed to make participation on the part of publishers as simple as possible without seriously prejudicing the effectiveness of Cataloging-in-Source. It was known that some publishers had objections to printing the catalog entry on the verso of the title page. The Library, therefore, expressed an order of preference as to the placement of the entry but left the actual decision to the publisher. It was also known that many publishers considered the typographical format of Library of Congress cards incongruous with the typographical design of their books and provision was made for a number of alternatives, ranging from an exact reproduction of the entry to a condensed resetting. There was no compromise as to completeness of information, punctuation, or capitalization. This generally flexible attitude was based on the belief that it was desirable to get Cataloging-in-Source information in some form into as many publications as possible.

The mailing labels supplied insured rapid transit in the mails through the special delivery specification and prompt delivery within the Library, and they relieved the publishers of mailing costs. When distances from Washington were sufficiently great, publishers were instructed to stamp their packages for air mail delivery. Similar arrangements were made for returning the proofs to the publishers with the catalog entry. In order to get the entry into the hands of publishers as expeditiously as possible, a chart was compiled of the hours at which there would be inter-office pick-ups at two nearby street mailboxes with varying schedules. To effect pick-ups and deliveries to Washington publishers, messengers were sent by taxi.

Data sheets were provided for recording essential information not contained in the proof sheets themselves, because it was known that complete proofs for all works cataloged would not be forthcoming. The problem here was to anticipate the information that might be lacking and to find words that would make clear to the publisher the nature of this information. As the project progressed, shortcomings in the data sheets were identified and remedied by suitable revisions. Material illustrating this phase of the experiment will be found in appendix D.

Cataloging at the Library of Congress

The Library's experience with Cataloging-in-Source actually antedated the formal experiment by nearly half a year. This came about by the coincidence that the U. S. National Health Survey made inquiries of the Library in January 1958 concerning better identification indicia for its publications. Informed of the exploratory survey being conducted by Andrew Osborn during that month, the Survey's interest was aroused and it was agreed that monographs in the Health Statistics series would be given pre-publication cataloging and the entries reproduced in the publications themselves. This pilot project, however, did not involve the elements of volume and urgency that characterized the Cataloging-in-Source experiment itself.

Procedures

At the beginning of the project the Director of the Processing Department appointed a committee to plan the routines to be followed. The members of this committee were C. Sumner Spalding, Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Chairman; Richard S. Angell, Chief, Subject Cataloging Division; Edward A. Finlayson, Chief, Catalog Maintenance Division; and Mrs. Mary Ellis Kahler, Chief, Serial Record Division. This committee, in three successive meetings, drafted the original procedures but changes which seemed necessary were subsequently worked out on an informal basis, usually in the Descriptive Cataloging Division which was charged with the responsibility for coordination. The details that had to be

settled were many and complex, due to the intricate interrelationships between the Library' selection, cataloging, cooperative cataloging, shelflisting, card printing, card distribution, card preparation, and serial recording operations. It was found expedient to assign the administrative supervision of these details to one person, Barbara P. Andrews, Administrative Assistant, Descriptive Cataloging Division, who was designated as the expediter.

The following is the basic procedural routine in its final form.

Receipt of publication proof and data sheets

1. Typist in Descriptive Cataloging Division received and logged in the items. Logging in consisted of typing card entry for tickler file and a rush slip for the publication proof, listing on each the author, title, publisher, day, and hour.

Examination of material

2. Expediter examined material to see if all information needed for cataloging was included. If telephone call appeared necessary, searched file for telephone number and name of person to contact. Determined whether work should be routed to the Serials or English Language Section.

Descriptive cataloging

3. Section head indicated full or limited cataloging and assigned the work to a cataloger.

4. Descriptive cataloger cataloged the work. For new monographic series obtained decision on cataloging and classification as a set or as separate monographs and recorded it on slip which was forwarded with publication proof, another copy of slips being sent to the Serial Record Division.

5. Typist copied essential information from manuscript card onto a slip to be sent to the Card Division, making a carbon copy on a card for the shelflist.

Subject cataloging, classification, and shelflisting

6. Subject cataloging distributor assigned work to subject cataloger.

7. Subject cataloger indicated subject headings and Library of Congress classification.

8. Shelflisting distributor assigned work to shelflister.

9. Shelflister added book number and inserted control card in shelflist, using carbon copy supplied by the Descriptive Cataloging Division.

10. Decimal Classification Office indicated Dewey Decimal classification, returned publication proof to expediter, and sent card to Editor of Subject Headings.

11. Editor of Subject Headings checked headings assigned to work and sent card to Card Division.

Card Division

12. Card Division estimator searched entry for pre-assigned card number. If none had been assigned previously, he assigned one. Estimating assistant took card to Printing Office, picked up card proofs when they were ready, and delivered them to expediter in Descriptive Cataloging Division. Entries and type were held for 2 weeks to add additional information, e.g., number of pages or other data, or changed information. (Experience early in the project indicated holding of final printing as necessary because of these factors). Manuscript cards were then forwarded by Card Division to Printing Office with instructions to print.

Final steps

13. When publication proof was returned by Decimal Classification Office, expediter checked to see if there was a note from the cataloger that information was wanting or needed to be verified. If necessary, wrote letter to publisher. Had typist prepare envelope for mailing card proof, and label for mailing publication proof so that both could be mailed as soon as card proof was received from the Printing Office.

14. When the card proof was received, the expediter examined it quickly to make certain that the cataloging was as complete as possible, that instructions on the data sheets had been followed, that necessary explanations had been made to the publisher, and that publisher was asked to verify any questionable information.

15. Expediter cleared tickler file and checked rush slip to see if deadline would be met through regular Library mail pick-up or whether catalog entry proof should be mailed in street mailbox, indicating instructions as necessary.

16. Messenger took publication proof to Card Division for wrapping and mailing.

17. At the end of the day typist in Descriptive Cataloging Division cut one copy of card proof to card size and took it to Filing Section for filing in the Official Catalog.

In addition to the above, special procedures had to be devised for: a) Cataloging-in-Source titles cataloged by cooperating libraries, b) titles not selected for addition to the collections of the Library of Congress, c) titles in series that would not normally be analyzed by the Library, d) entries for series that are not collected at the Library of Congress, e) reprinting for necessary changes or corrections, and f) processing the final publication when received and releasing the cards for filing in the catalogs.

Operations

It was clear form the beginning that without the greatest rapidity in handling the page proofs, Cataloging-in Source could not be meshed into the time schedules of the publishers. Accordingly, "rush" procedures for cataloging regular books were adapted and stepped up and the resulting procedures were referred to as "non-stop rush." Each title received was given immediate and individual handling at every stage and hand carried to the succeeding stage. The only point at which there was group handling was in the actual printing of the cataloging copy.

When proof was received the schedule called for cataloging, printing the catalog entry, and mailing it to the publisher within 24 hours after receipt (excluding the intervention of weekends and holidays). There was an even tighter schedule for the 100 titles cataloged cooperatively by the Department of Agriculture Library. For these titles all of the following steps had to be performed within the 24-hour period: pick-up of page proof from the issuing agency, cataloging at the Department library, delivery of copy to the Library of Congress, editing of copy, printing the card proof, delivery to the Department of Agriculture Library, and final delivery to the issuing agency.

The telephone played a prominent part in the project. Calls were made to publishers by the cataloger involved when page proofs and data sheets failed to provide essential information, when there was an inconsistency between them, and when there was any reason to suspect the accuracy or completeness of the resultant cataloging.

Despite the tight operating schedule, the Library was unwilling that speed should be allowed to interfere with the quality of the cataloging, except insofar as the very nature of Cataloging-in-Source should force such a result. The catalogers were instructed to work no faster and no less carefully on Cataloging-in-Source titles than on any other. It was emphasized, however, that once assigned a title, they should work steadily on it, carry it to completion, and deliver it personally to the next person in the chain of operations.

Stages in the regular cataloging process were bypassed or consolidated whenever possible. For example, selection, normally performed as a separate operation by the Selection Officer, was delegated to Frances M. Fisher, Head of the English Language Section in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, in whose section almost all of the monographic works were cataloged. This was carried out concurrently with the distribution of page proofs to the individual catalogers. Pre-cataloging searching was obviously unnecessary. Preliminary cataloging as such was eliminated for Cataloging-in-Source titles but briefly typed slips were made from the cataloging copy prepared by the descriptive cataloger for control purposes in the shelflist and in the Card Division. Revision of the descriptive cataloging was eliminated by the decision to assign Cataloging-in-Source titles only to independent catalogers.

The expediter played a vital role in the operation of the project. In addition to the functions outlined above under procedural routines, the expediter acted as liaison between the several divisions involved and as a "trouble shooter" when problems developed or bottle-necks threatened. She also wrote or drafted correspondence to publishers concerning all phases of the experiment. During the course of the project, and particularly following its termination, she had the intricate task of compiling and supervising the compilation of the pertinent statistics on titles cataloged, published titles received, number and types of discrepancies between the published book and the cataloging entry, letters sent, telephone calls made, and other phases of the operation for use in this report.

Types of Publications Cataloged

The works cataloged reflected the varied character of the publishers participating. There were trade books, textbooks, children's books, religious books, publications from university presses, from national associations, from the Government Printing Office, and publications issued directly by State and Federal agencies. From the bibliographical point of view, the bulk were new monographs. There were also reprintings from plates and offset reprints from houses specializing in this work. In the former case, the printed card, made for

an earlier impression, was used without change; in the latter, the reprint publisher filled in a data sheet designed for this type of publication and a new entry was prepared for the offset edition, based on the printed card for the earlier edition and on the modifications indicated on the data sheet. In neither of these cases was proof supplied by the publisher.

For monographs published in series there was prepared, in addition to the entry for the monograph itself, an entry for the series if the latter were judged to be of a type that many libraries might wish to collect as a set. It was made clear to the publisher that the use of the series entry was optional. In some cases both entries were printed and in others only the monographic entry was used. Monographs in series presented a problem to the Library and their handling under Cataloging-in-Source procedures interrupted the Library's regular operations. In 113 instances it resulted in cataloging which the Library would not have done for itself. If the regular treatment of a series was as an unanalyzed collected set, the Library would not have made the monographic entry. If as dispersed monographs, the Library would not have made a series entry. In the former case the Cataloging-in-Source analytic was used in the Library's catalogs in 51 instances and was not used in 58 instances; in the latter, in 4 instances no use was made of the series entry.

In addition to the series entries included in the project, other serial entries were involved. One of the largest categories of these were the entries used in the Library of Congress' own serial publications and there were also a number of entries for yearbooks. Many of these serial entries were for publications that had been in existence for some time, hence printed cards were generally available. In all cases, however, these cards were reviewed and, if necessary, reprinted to bring them up-to-date.

Cooperative Cataloging

One purpose of the experiment was to test the feasibility of using cooperative cataloging in Cataloging-in-Source. The Department of Agriculture Library cataloged 100 titles published by agencies of the department. The libraries of the

Geological Survey, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cataloged a total of 116 publications issued by their agencies, and the libraries of the universities of Illinois, Maryland, and Wisconsin, and of Harvard University cataloged 19 of the publications of their university presses. The Department of Agriculture Library kept a full record of its experience with the project and its report is reproduced as appendix E. Appendix F, table 2 shows statistically the characteristics of Cataloging-in-Source publications in respect to monographs versus serials, the use of existing printed cards and revised printed cards, U. S. official publications versus other publications, and titles cataloged by cooperating libraries versus those cataloged entirely at the Library of Congress.

Handling of Books after Publication

A large number of the titles cataloged during the experiment were first received in their finished form in the Card Division. These included both U. S. official publications and trade publications received prior to their publication dates from publishers cooperating in the "All-the-Books" program. If received in the Card Division and found to contain a catalog entry, these books were identified as Cataloging-in-Source titles and slipped accordingly for the Preliminary Cataloging Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division. Many titles, however, were received which had actually been given Cataloging-in-Source treatment but which, for various reasons, did not contain the catalog entry. These were not caught until they reached the Preliminary Cataloging Section in the usual course of events and were identified by a preliminary cataloger as Cataloging-in-Source titles. This was also true of the considerable number of books first received in the Copyright Office. It was not feasible for the Copyright Office to examine deposits for Cataloging-in-Source entries and these titles were not identified until they arrived in the Descriptive Cataloging Division. (This mixture of procedures led, understandably, to a considerable amount of confusion and extra work.)

When the book was received in the Preliminary Cataloging Section the usual routine was as follows:

1. Searcher located the printed card in the Official Catalog, procured additional copies of it, and sent book and cards to the cataloger whose initials appeared on the main entry in the Official Catalog.

2. Cataloger verified accuracy of the card, indicated receipt of book on the Official Catalog main entry, and forwarded book and extra cards to Shelflisting Section. (If card was found to be erroneous, cataloger corrected main entry and another card for Cataloging-in-Source records, and initiated reprinting.)

3. Shelflister adapted one of printed cards for shelflist entry, verifying call numbers and adding any pertinent notes concerning volumes, copies, etc., notified Card Preparation Section to release cards to catalogs and sent information card (for serial publications) to Serial Record Division.

These routines were largely modeled on those followed in adapting previously printed cooperative cataloging cards after the book is received in the Library of Congress but some elements were peculiar to the Cataloging-in-Source experiment and they further complicated the already complex network of procedures. This was particularly true of monographs in series which the Library would normally either not have analyzed or analyzed only in part. At the cataloging stage, records of decisions as to treatment had to be changed to reflect the changed situation. The processing of these publications, when they were received in their final form, was even more troublesome. A satisfactory solution was never found to the problem of insuring that the Shelflisting Section and the Card Preparation Section were informed of the receipt of these monographs in order that they might release the cards to the Library's catalogs. As this report was being written, extensive rechecking was still going on to straighten out failures in the execution of these and other procedures.

Problems Encountered

Incompleteness of information

The problems involved in Cataloging-in-Source were largely intrinsic to the nature of the experiment itself. It should be noted and emphasized that the cataloger was faced with the task of cataloging something not quite complete and still subject to change in terms of a finished and immutable product. In theory, the proof and the data sheet should have presented a complete picture but in many cases they did not. Whenever incompleteness was discernible, a telephone call was made to the publisher by the cataloger to secure the missing information. But incompleteness was not always discernible. If the preface was not yet in proof and the data sheet made no mention of it, if the title page information was incomplete, or if essential information for the collation had not been supplied, the cataloger would be none the wiser.

Material for cataloging was received in a variety of stages, as follows:

Main text in some form:

1. Complete page proof and data sheet.

2. Complete galley proof and data sheet.

3. Cooperative cataloging copy with camera copy of text, no data sheet.

4. Cooperative cataloging copy, page proofs, data sheet.

5. Proof of main text with typed transcription of the title page, data sheet.

6. Proof of main text, data sheet, without title page, preliminary matter or index.

7. Proof of main text, data sheet, without index.

8. Complete proof of text, data sheet, without illustrative matter.

9. Uncorrected proof, with data sheet.

10. Typescript of main text, with no data sheet.

11. London edition of printed book with changes noted in ink for American edition, with data sheet.

Main text lacking:

12. Cooperative cataloging copy only.

13. Data sheet with title page, preface, table of contents.

(This was the situation as regards a group of titles issued by one of the leading medical publishers. The Library agreed, as an experiment, to attempt the assignment of subject headings and classification symbols to these titles without having the main text in hand. This was found to be possible, so far as this limited test was concerned.)

14. Data sheet with edited tear sheets.

15. Data sheet with verifax or thermofax of title page.

16. Data sheet with title page transcription typed on verso.

17. Data sheet only (for reprints).

18. Data sheet only.

19. Letter or memorandum from publisher naming title to be reprinted, or issued (in the case of a serial).

Miscellaneous:

20. Index sent after LC entry prepared.

21. Revised title page sent after LC entry prepared.

Most vexing of all problems of incompleteness was that of the pagination of the still unset index. Production schedules were often such that when the publisher had to go to press with the copyright page, the index was still being set and its paging could not be exactly determined. A partial solution was found by omitting pagination in the proof of the card sent to the publisher and forwarding explicit instructions as to how to set the missing section when the index pagination was established. The type for the card was held until this information was supplied. This was not always successful, largely because of misunderstandings about foliation. The publisher might report that there were 28 pages in the index and this information would be used in preparing the catalog entry. In the published book, however, the index might be foliated as 27 pages with the final portion following on the unnumbered verso of page 27.

Changes

The timing of the project was such that many of the books cataloged were scheduled for publication at the end of 1958. Some of these were not actually published until 1959. In many instances, when particular titles were being cataloged, the year of publication had become uncertain or was later changed from that indicated in the page proof or the data sheet. Sometimes the publisher corrected the catalog entry and informed the Library but in other instances this was not done.

There were other changes in the title page. The title proper was rarely changed but it was not uncommon for subtitles and credits for editors, illustrators, and the like to be added, deleted, or changed at the last moment. More often than not the catalog entry appearing in the work was not altered by the publisher to reflect these changes nor was the Library notified so that the cards could be corrected.

A telling illustration of how last-minute changes by publishers can affect Cataloging-in-Source is the case of the publisher who decided to distribute catalog cards with each copy of one of his books. Proof and data sheets were received, an uncertainty as to pagination was cleared up by telephone and

letter, the work was cataloged, proof of the card sent to the publisher and returned with his approval, and the 17,000 cards were printed, delivered, and billed. When the book was received it was found that a subtitle had been added to the title page!

The over-all wastage, due to changes such as this, amounted to 235,000 cards or $1,500. The Library was reimbursed for this amount from the Cataloging-in-Source grant.

Use of the telephone by the cataloger solved a number of the immediate questions that arose in the course of the cataloging. In spite of this, there were a great many occasions when the best answers the cataloger could get were: "I think it will be thus and so" or "We just don't know yet." Perhaps worse than these were firm answers that turned out to be either incorrect or else reflected a decision that was later changed. In short, there were many cases when the cataloger, in the end, had to make the best guess possible. These matters were called to the attention of the publishers and type for the printed cards was held for 2 weeks to permit corrections. Sometimes matters were straightened out; sometimes they were not.

Appendix F, table 1 gives statistics on letters sent and telephone calls made in connection with the cataloging. It reveals that 541 letters were written in connection with the cataloging of 386 titles and 120 telephone calls were made regarding 115 titles. That is, 31% of the 1,203 titles cataloged required one or more letters and 9% required one or more telephone calls. This is indicative of the degree to which, despite wholehearted cooperation on the part of the publishers, there were still uncertainties to be resolved and loose ends to be tied up.

The cataloging which gave the least trouble was that for offset reprint editions when there was already a printed card for the original edition. In these instances, the publisher merely supplied on a special data sheet the details of bibliographical differences between the two editions. With all the necessary information theoretically in hand, it should then have been a comparatively simple matter to produce the new catalog entry. Even here, nevertheless, errors occurred due to circumstances beyond the catalogers' control.

Criticisms

When Cataloging-in-Source was first considered, it was anticipated that one difficulty would be occasional dissatisfaction on the part of authors and publishers with the choice of entry, form of name, choice and form of subject headings, and other details of the cataloging. Generally speaking, such problems were fewer than had been expected. There were few criticisms as regards subject headings and classification but one publisher objected to the subdivision "--Fiction" for a series of titles which he considered to be biographies. The details of descriptive cataloging evoked no reaction except that the variation in treatment of pagination, depending on whether the book was given full or limited cataloging, was puzzling to many publishers.

Questions on choice of entry were also few. A prolonged correspondence with the editor of a textbook originally written by another person was necessary to explain that since the publisher still published it as the original author's work it had to be entered under his name, even though the editor had largely rewritten it. The entry of a work of multiple corporate authorship under the author first-named disturbed the editors who considered a later-named corporate body as being principally responsible. The entry of one work under the name of a symposium and of another under the name of a seminar had to be explained to the publishers. The use of an anonymous classic heading, such as Bible or The Advent (Anglo-Saxon Lyrics), also had to be explained. In two instances, one a publication of the Library of Congress itself, the original author statement was changed by the publisher to achieve a more satisfactory catalog entry. In another instance, not related to choice of entry, a well-known publisher changed the sequence of places of publication in his time-honored imprint to bring the principal city into first position.

The form of name given in headings presented more serious problems. Publishers strongly objected to real name entries for works published pseudonymously. Such entries proved to be unacceptable and were not printed in the books themselves. There was also considerable objection (usually after the fact) from authors on the use of their birthdates in the headings.

Catalogers' Reaction

When the project was completed, the participating catalogers were asked for their reactions to cataloging books in the proof stage. Though they were sympathetic to the objectives of Cataloging-in-Source, they were unanimous in regarding this type of cataloging as unrewarding and taxing. It was unrewarding because, despite their best efforts, the end product was so frequently inaccurate. Inaccuracies occur in any form of cataloging but with far less frequency and in regular cataloging an error discovered can be corrected by reprinting the card. In Cataloging-in-Source the error stands forever on the pages of the book. The participating catalogers, because they have a professional approach to their work, were unable to accept this result with equanimity. The work was taxing because of the over-all time limit, the presence of the "rush" slip, the necessity for recording the exact amount of time spent, and the special difficulties involved in working with proofs and data sheets. These factors combined to produce a feeling of tension and considerably greater fatigue than in regular cataloging.

Results of the Cataloging

The project got under way in June 1958 when the first 2 titles were received. The volume of cataloging increased steadily thereafter as follows:

	Titles
July	25
August	93
September	86
October	186
November	219
December	223
January	233

The average work load during the period November 1958--January 1959 was 11 titles per working day, with as many as 18 titles on peak days. The 1,000th title was cataloged in January and the project terminated at the end of February with the cataloging during that month of an additional 172 titles. By that time 1,203 books had been cataloged.

Speed of Execution

One of the principal purposes of the experiment was to determine whether Cataloging-in-Source could be performed with sufficient dispatch to meet the schedules involved in the complicated processes of publishing. Comments received from publishers and analyzed in the following section of this report make it clear that those books which publishers, for various reasons, wish to get out at the earliest moment cannot be given Cataloging-in-Source treatment because the time required to send the proofs to the Library of Congress, have them cataloged, and returned with a catalog entry cannot be spared. These are a minority of all the books issued but they are a considerable minority. Some titles in this category were sent for cataloging under the project but the Library was unable to meet the necessary deadlines.

Appendix F, table 3 presents data on the time required to execute Cataloging-in-Source at the Library of Congress. The table shows that 86% of the publications were completely processed within a 24-hour period, 93% within a 26-hour period, and 99% within a period of 48 hours. It also gives the average elapsed time between the receipt of proof and the mailing of cataloging copy for all publications taken together and for particular types of publications and types of cataloging. The overall average elapsed time was 7 hours and 10 minutes. It should be noted that deductions based on the analytical figures in this table are hazardous. In the first place, the immediate delivery by messenger of card proof for most cooperatively cataloged titles is an important factor in the apparently large difference in overall elapsed time between titles cataloged cooperatively and titles cataloged entirely at the Library of Congress. In the latter case, depending on whether the 24-hour deadline was threatened, the copy may have had layover time between its completion and the pickup of the next regular mail. Further, it should be kept in mind that 60% of all U. S. official publications were cooperatively cataloged and 91% of all cooperatively cataloged titles were U. S. official publications.

Table 4 in appendix F gives the average working time per entry for the more important operations. In the section on cataloging operations each figure is the average start-stop time recorded by persons performing the indicated operation. In the card and printing operations the figures are for overall elapsed time. The difference is that in the latter case layover waiting time is included.

Accuracy of Execution

The experiment was least successful as regards the accuracy of the end product. Appendix F, table 5 displays in considerable detail the number and types of discrepancies between the catalog entries prepared and the actual characteristics of the final publications. It should be noted that the discrepancies recorded are for entries supplied. In 105 instances the entries were not actually used. In the instances in which the entry was used, it was nearly always printed as follows: 1) either exactly as prepared (excluding considerations of format), 2) with missing information supplied (as in those instances where final pagination could not be ascertained at the time of cataloging, or 3) (in some few cases) with corrections supplied (almost exclusively in imprint or collation). Instances of changes made by the publisher resulting in erroneous cataloging were very rare. The crucial fact revealed by table 1 in appendix F is that 615 or 48% of the entries had some discrepancy with the book as published. The number of cooperating publishers was 157 and the books cataloged under the experiment for all but 27 of these contained one or more errors.

An analysis of the figures in table 5 of appendix F reveals that 9.4% of the discrepancies were in title page transcription (exclusive of imprint), 17.3% were in imprint, and 47.5% were in collation. On the other hand, only 2.6% of the entries involved a discrepancy in the main entry and only 4.5% discrepancies in subject headings or classification. On entries involving discrepancies there was an average occurrence of 1.7 discrepancies.

Characteristics of Printed Entries

The catalog entry was used in about 90% of the publications cataloged. Table 6 in appendix F indicates that about 68% of the entries were reset and 32% were photoreproduced. When reset the entry was usually in the approximate style of a printed catalog card but 15.4% were reset with the type closed up. When photoreproduced 3.5% of the entries were reduced in size. These variations are illustrated in the examples to be found in appendix G and table 6 of appendix F analyzes the positioning of the entries.

PUBLISHER EXPERIENCE AND ATTITUDE

Letters Received

Following the conclusion in February 1959 of the cataloging phase of the project, the Library addressed a letter to all those publishers who had cooperated in the experiment, requesting a statement as to their experience during the period of their participation in the project. The revelant portion of the letter was as follows:

> "We would now greatly appreciate a frank statement from you at your earliest convenience giving us information about your participation experience in the project on the following points:
>
> a) mailing arrangements for sending the proof to the Library of Congress and its return with the catalog entry to you,
>
> b) use of data sheets in supplying bibliographical information not available in proof supplied,
>
> c) interruptions to your editorial and production scheduling and the effects of such interruptions on your printing and publication scheduling. (please indicate your experience in this connection as between normal and tight printing schedule requirements and the amount of your annual production on a tight schedule),
>
> d) design problems encountered,
>
> e) estimate of your extra costs incurred (please supply estimated average cost per title), and
>
> f) other comments,
>
> Your general attitude on continuing cooperation in a permanent Cataloging-in-Source program would also be appreciated."

Replies were received from 114 publishers or more than 70% of the 157 firms which actually forwarded proofs to the Library for cataloging. Their responses are analyzed in the sections which follow.

Mailing Arrangements

The mailing arrangements met with general satisfaction but were not adequate in all instances. A Midwestern firm wrote: "The mailing arrangements for sending the proofs to the Library of Congress were superb, as was the quick return of the catalog entry. I do not see how this could be improved in any way." A publisher in the Rocky Mountain area replied: "Excellent handling on your part; also the special telegraphing of information." A Philadelphia firm responded: "Mailing arrangements were fine. Your office returned the proof we sent and the catalog card material in remarkably rapid time." These replies are typical of the great majority. Some companies expressed only qualified approval of the arrangements. A Boston publisher wrote: "It seemed to us that the mailing arrangements for sending the proof to you and its return are generally satisfactory, but usually there is not enough time between the absolutely final proof here, and the time when we feel we must go to press. Holidays and weekends also caused delays." A Southern firm replied: "We have no criticism of the mailing service during the experiment. However, this was an experiment, and your people no doubt were making an all-out effort. If this program was adopted as a daily routine, would the service be as prompt?" A company in the Midwest responded: "There is no serious problem about the mailing arrangements, although it did take longer for this to be handled than the three days that were originally estimated." Another Midwestern firm had this experience: "Proofs usually spent four days or more in transit and on one occasion spent six days because of bad weather. This can be a long wait when scheduling is tight." A publisher in New York found that: "The interval between our mailing the proofs and our receiving the entries was seldom more than four days," and another firm in that city reported: "On the matter of mailing proofs and getting the entry from you, we found that it usually took 4 days for us to get the entry and sometimes 5. This necessitated a good deal of checking on our part and frequently meant holding back our printing orders waiting for the copy to come in." Most of those replying, however, found the mailing arrangements satisfactory.

Data Sheets

The use of the data sheets also presented no difficulties to most of the publishers. One publishing house in New York commented: "Simple to fill out and required no great amount of time. The revised form was a great improvement over the previous form." And another in the same city: "Data sheets seem to work well." A Midwestern firm found them "A convenient help and a timesaver" and a Washington agency reported: "Data sheets seemed well desgined and simple enough. They took little time to complete." This reaction was a common one but by no means universal. A university press in the Middle West wrote: "Data sheets are easy to use in most cases, the main exception being offset reprints where you ask how the new book differs from the old one and we are not sure how much detail to go into." A company in Pennsylvania reported: "The data sheets did not usually cause any difficulty except in certain cases where we did not have readily available the author's middle name." A Southwestern firm commented: "Our main problem in connection with supplying the data arose from the fact that we usually do not have the completed index in hand until the printing of the book is in process."

Some commentators considered the data sheets to be deficient in a number of respects. A California press reported: "Some of the questions are a little vague. Three revisions in the course of the year made the form no clearer to us," and one in New York wrote: "Some of the entries on the data sheets seemed to be subject to varying interpretations according to individual reactions." There were criticisms of the items relating to pagination, maps, and illustrations and of the terminology used. A number of publishers found filling out the data sheets a considerable chore. Two of them employed the word "nuisance." One company in Philadelphia wrote: "Filling in a data sheet requires 15 or 20 minutes of a stenographer's time. Where a large number of titles are involved, this could become cumbersome" and another in that city found that "This required the time of a clerk to fill in the necessary data listed on the sheets."

Some considered the use of the data sheets to be unnecessary. A publisher in the Middle Atlantic States reported: "Our general purpose is to send you the final page proofs, instead of using the data sheets that you have supplied" and from

a Chicago firm came the comment: "The data sheets seemed to be largely irrelevant as a complement to the page proofs themselves." A New York company replied: "The data sheets were cumbersome and seemed largely unnecessary. Virtually all the data asked for could be derived from the proofs." A majority of the publishers, nevertheless, experienced a minimum of difficulty in the use of the data sheets.

Interruptions to Schedules

The interruption of production schedules was reported by a great majority of publishers as being a very real problem. Only a few firms experienced no difficulties of this sort and in most of these instances special factors were involved. A company in New England wrote: "The fact that we do our own composition in a plant located in the same building as our editorial department may account for our being able to report that we had no delay in our production schedule, which was tight and almost always is." This was also the case with a Midwestern firm which explained that it was a fully-contained publishing house with editorial work, printing, and binding in one building. Some firms were exceptions to the general rule in that they did not operate on tight schedules, others had sent only a token number of titles for cataloging. In a number of instances schedules were sufficiently flexible to prevent the occurrence of major difficulties. A publishing house in New York replied: "Since we normally allow at least one week for corrections by the author and copy editor of the final page proofs, we did not find that waiting for your proofs delayed us." One of the university presses wrote in similar vein: "We have not encountered delay since we have sent the page proof to you at the same time that it goes to the author, thus giving us an interval of at least two weeks."

One publisher who reported no serious difficulties added: "This may have to be revised if the program becomes permanent and we submit all our books to the Library for pre-publication cataloging." A State agency wrote that it had not sent any publications "that had to meet a deadline" and several firms explained that they had sent page proofs without the index in order not to delay their schedules. A major New York company reported: "If the schedule simply got too tight, we just did not ask for the entry and reverted to putting the catalog card number on the copyright page." Some firms not

experiencing real delays nevertheless mentioned the factors of "anxiety," "nuisance," and annoyance."

On the other hand, many publishers experienced major difficulties in adapting their procedures to the requirements of the experiment. A firm specializing in technical works wrote: "This was a real problem. Since the entry was on the copyright page, the front matter had to be held until the very last minute. Since you wanted to know the last page of the index and since most of our books have indexes, this meant that by the time we were ready to send such information it was really too late to send a complete set of pages for cataloging. By the time the index is paged up, the printer is usually locking up the front matter and the job proper, so that when the index paged proof is returned to him he is practically ready for the press. I would say that as far as the publishers of technical books are concerned, Cataloging-in-Source is just too much trouble. It is not a lack of willingness on the publishers' part, it is a lack of time."

A general publisher in Chicago had a similar experience: "Our biggest difficulty was with those titles we were hurrying through the page proof state. Although you return your pages in 24 hours, we actually have to allow a week from the time we send them to you until we receive the catalog information back. On a couple of occasions, our schedule was so tight we had to phone this information long distance to our typesetter. Another complication we encountered was in connection with indexes. The page proof you received, of course, never has the index. By the time we got the type set on the index, we were in the last stages of the book and had to make sure we disciplined ourselves to make the page corrections necessary in your catalog information. As an added detail to an operation already over-burdened with them, this was somewhat annoying and could be subject to indefinite error."

A New York firm reported: "Perhaps 75 per cent of the books we publish are on tight production schedules. This program adds a few more details to a task already abounding in minutiae. In addition to acquiring and printing the card, it is necessary to do a certain amount of record keeping and follow up." Another publisher in New York noted: "We did have several cases where the time for printing and binding was cut

by several days due to the cataloging." A university press wrote: "We estimate that the insertion of the catalog card information in a book costs a minimum of two weeks' time. Since our production is usually on a tight schedule, due to limited staff, we can ill afford to lose these two weeks." A. U. S. Government agency reported: "Though the Department staff and that of the Library of Congress did an excellent job of furnishing copy for the bulletins, schedules were thrown off by as much as two or three weeks."

The complexities involved in Cataloging-in-Source, from the publishers' point of view are illustrated by a letter from a well-known New York firm: "Here was the rub. Too many extra steps for too many people. First, an extra set of page proofs had to be pulled. Not to mention labor cost, this involved taking one member of our small page make-up staff away from his primary duties for several hours. On receipt of the entry proof, the assistant to the head of the manufacturing department had to send it to an engraver, transmit the finished line cut to the press for printing, etc. A proof of the line cut had to be transmitted to a copy editor for checking, and the same copy editor had to follow-up on the entire operation, from the pulling of the extra proofs to the final okaying of the line cut. While this did not take as much time as the pulling of the proofs, it still took some time and care; it added several small steps to the normal routine. Finally, because we printed the catalog entry on the back fly-leaf, it was necessary to postpone the gluing of the back endsheet to the board until the last possible moment, whereas it would have been desirable to do this before the printing of the text of the book, at the same time the front endsheet was glued. Cumulatively, these changes in timing and additional steps had the effect of complicating and slowing down our production schedules.

"As regards 'normal' versus 'tight' scheduling, the distinction does not exist for us in the later stages of producing a book. We may schedule the setting and make-up of a book on a 'filler' basis; i.e., plan to work on it only in intervals between more closely scheduled publications. But no matter at what pace we have started, by the time we reach the final stages we are running. No matter how loose the lino

schedule for a book, its press schedule will usually be as tight as that of a book tightly scheduled from the start. The requirements for maximum press utilization make this inevitable."

Publishing houses which had no set of page proofs which they could spare for sending to the Library of Congress reported additional difficulties, as did those publishers which have their printing done by one or more printers located in other cities, sometimes in the same area but in other instances several thousand miles distant.

Design Problems

In contrast to the above, most of the publishers responding to the Library's inquiry reported that the problem of design had not been a serious one. The comment "No problem" was repeated in a large number of letters. Some firms experienced minor difficulties but succeeded in overcoming them. One Chicago publisher wrote: "This will pose the second largest problem (second to the time element). As I see it, each time we would use this Cataloging-in-Source information it will have to be handled as a special problem in design." Criticisms on esthetic grounds were frequent, with such comments as: "The printing of the material requested does not make for a pretty page" and "It's almost impossible to make the entry look nice, or even unobstrusive, without drastically changing its form and thereby detracting from its usefulness." A university press commented: "There is no question in our mind but that the card defaces the copyright page of the book. After experimenting with different sizes of type in connection with it, we resignedly put a number of them at the back of the book. This did not help much--merely succeeding in defacing the last page of the book." A number of publishers reported: "This was a source of great unhappiness for our designer" or "Our designers disliked the system intensely." A designer at a university press commented: "In presenting the necessary material, it is difficult to plan a blank page at the end of a book, since most books are not that accurately estimated in total pages. On the other hand, presenting material on the copyright page a design problem is encountered. After many pains are taken in designing the title page, we have to back it with the typographic junk-yard of LC

information. Ergo, a conflict of style. Since the modern design trend is toward simplicity, the complexity of the LC information in relation to the title page is much the same as a Victorian divan in a Frank Lloyd Wright living room."

A Government agency wrote: "Somehow no two jobs came out alike even though the printer had explicit instructions" and a university press reported: "In three of our books Cataloging-in-Source was rejected because it would have interfered with the design." In an effort to improve the appearance of the catalog entry some publishers gave it a border of ruled or dotted lines.

The factor of cost in connection with design was mentioned by several publishers. One company wrote: "We feel that the placement of the catalog entry is our chief problem. On the copyright page, it seems an eye-sore, particularly in the art books which we publish, and in others where beauty is as important as utility. The copyright page already is somewhat crowded with necessary information. We like to keep as much apparatus as possible away from the front of the books, and hence have tended to take your suggestion about putting it at the end of the book, after the index. The problem arises of what to do when there is no room on the last page of the index, and when that is the last page of the final signature. We ran into one emergency lately, where we had actually to add a four page signature to accommodate the Library of Congress entry. This, of course, was costly and wasteful. We have also run-in the material in a continuous paragraph form, and I simply wonder whether the variety of ways in which you get the material is convenient for your use."

On the whole, however, the majority of publishers did not consider design to be a major problem.

Estimate of Extra Costs Incurred

Estimates as to the average additional cost per title varied widely. About 10% of those replying reported no additional costs. Another group, amounting to about 25% of the total, incurred only negligible or minimal extra costs. Special factors were sometimes responsible for this report. One Midwestern publisher explained: "Since we have

been using offset lithography exclusively, it costs nothing to drop your cards on a final page of repro proof and slide it under the camera." A university publisher replied: "There was no extra expense incurred in getting proofs for you. We always have to take a great many proofs for our authors, etc., and one more on thin stock went through as part of the routine." Many of the firms reporting negligible additional costs were offset publishers or did not need to pull an extra set of proofs for the experiment.

Actual estimates of additional average costs per title ranged from a low of $2 to a high of $67. One company estimated that the "cost in special circumstances (such as adding the extra signature) would be about $75." Most estimates were in the range between $5 and $25. One firm which suggested the figure of $5 added: "However, this merely represents the cost of typesetting the information. The greater cost would be pulling the extra set of page proofs." Estimates as to the cost of proofs varied from 2 to 15 cents per page. One publisher commented: "We estimate a cost of $10 per title. This is a minor sum in the case of books, but bulks larger in the printing of pamphlets and bulletins."

As to over-all costs, a West Coast university press, issuing fifty titles a year, estimated the extra costs at $20 per title or $1,000 per year. A major commercial publisher wrote: "The actual cost per entry in money paid out was about $10 per title, covering the cost of composition and the plating. This $10 per title would mean between $3,000 and $3,500 to us in a year in actual cash outlay." A Midwestern university press reported: "It seems clear that the operation, if carried out on a large scale and applied to all our publications, would prove both expensive and time-consuming. These costs should be carefully weighed against the benefits. Although final figures are not available, our production department estimates that the cost of using Cataloging-in-Source in one of our publications was $20 and in another $25. If we considered using Cataloging-in-Source in 40 books during a year, as we would have to in ordinary publishing years, the immediate, out-of-pocket cost would approach $500. In addition to this, we must allow for the overhead costs of work by our editorial and production departments. I would estimate this at not less than $25 per title. To this, again,

we must add the extra burden--not measurable as an expense--of preparing the supplementary data sheets and particularly of seeing that this information is set in type--and often plated--at a time when our editorial and production staff, and our printers are trying to meet a tight schedule." There were several comments that publishers should be reimbursed for their additional outlays. Two firms suggested the Library of Congress might send publishers a plate or a line cut of the catalog entry rather than a proof.

Other Comments

Under this category were grouped general comments on the experiment as a whole, favorable and unfavorable, specific comments on particular features of the project, and suggestions as to changes in procedures or alternative programs. A number of publishers were enthusiastic as to the results. Comments like the following were frequent: "Sorry that you are discontinuing the project. We hoped that it would become a permanent service of the Library of Congress." "We received comments from various customers who were highly delighted with the inclusion of the library card. A number of them hoped that the project would be continued." "This has been a most worthwhile and efficiently run project." "Our participation in the program was truthfully quite easy." "I trust that funds can be found to resume this very worthwhile activity in the near future." "We noted an early increase in orders from librarians for publications cataloged during the experiment." "If Cataloging-in-Source were made universal and were handled routinely, I think that the small problems which appeared to occur during the experimental stage would disappear."

An equal number were disappointed with the results. One publisher wrote: "It's a nuisance, a delay, and an expense." Another replied: "In general, I might say that the entire program has been a constant source of irritation to everybody on our staff. The complaints have been many and continuous, from the editors through the production and design people and into the manufacturing plant itself. It has won the enthusiasm of no one connected with it." One firm commented: "Our own personal feeling is that we would lose sales by having the catalog cards printed in the books.

Our own business is not confined to libraries and we feel that the customer picking up the book in the bookstore would object to seeing the catalog card printed because he might feel that this is only a book suitable for libraries. Moreover, we sell a great many books abroad and there are violent objections to the use of this material in such books." Other comments of this nature were: "Frankly, I cannot see any real advantage in this procedure." "From our standpoint the time spent on the project was not justified by the results" and "Frankly, we hope that the cataloging problem can be solved in some other way than this." A publisher in the Southwest commented: "My feeling from the beginning has been that Cataloging-in-Source shifts part of the library function onto the shoulders of the publisher. Since so many projects are resting on those very same shoulders these days, the publisher is finding himself somewhat in the position of the camel and the extra straw."

A number of other publishers also explained the grounds for their objections. One company wrote: "You might mention the difficulty we had tiwh several authors regarding the showing of their birth dates. Because of this we were unable to print the catalog entry since the Library insisted it must be shown so as to avoid confusion with another author with a similar name." Another mentioned "opposition due to the cataloging material appearing with the author's real name when the title page and copyright line use a pseudonym." Still a third commented: "On our biographies the Library often called them fiction when they should be classified as biography, plus social studies, medicine, science, or the particular background associated with the subject." Comments as to the difficulty of supplying final pagination, particularly on the index, were common.

Of a different nature were the comments: "If all books of all publishers are not covered by the program, obviously the present system of getting catalog card numbers would have to be continued to supplement Cataloging-in-Source and "It is our belief that libraries would find this service an enormous benefit if a large percentage of publishers would cooperate with all their books. If participation is on a hit and miss basis, the libraries would find it only a minor assistance."

Some publishers took a neutral ground. A firm in the Middle West wrote: "Whether the experiment was worthwhile depends entirely upon the reaction of book purchasers to the program" and a New York publisher reported "The continuance of the program would depend entirely on how helpful it has been to readers and to libraries."

There were suggestions that the number of pages be only estimated or that some such formula as "452 pages plus index" be adopted. The use of galley rather than page proofs was suggested in a number of instances and there were general comments as to the need for simplifying procedures and reducing costs. One publisher wrote: "My own feeling is that a far simpler system could easily be devised, without the necessity of printing the card in the book itself. For example, I cannot see that anything would be lost by your printing up the cards themselves before publication (on the basis of proofs furnished by the publisher) and simply furnishing them to libraries direct, as you do now. Under such a system, a library that has placed an advance order (before publication) with a publisher or jobber for a book can simply place its advance order with you for the card: the library would then have the card even before it had the book."

[Editorial note: Since 1953 the Library of Congress has conducted a special program designed to make printed cards for new books available by the time the books themselves are released. Publishers are asked to send to the Library a review copy of each new book as soon as bound copies are available and these are cataloged immediately upon receipt. In the fiscal year 1958-1959 more than 2,000 publishers sent nearly 12,000 titles under this program, making it possible in a large number of instances to fill card orders in advance of publication dates. The number of cooperating publishers grows annually and arrangements recently made with the Publishers' Weekly should greatly increase the number of review copies sent to the Library of Congress.]

Attitude on Continuing Cooperation in a Permanent Program

Most of the publishers replying to this question indicated that they would be willing to cooperate in a continuing Cataloging-in-Source program, if it provided a useful service to

libraries. This was an important qualification. As one publisher put it: "Before making such a commitment, however, we should like to have detailed information about the end result of the operation, its value to all libraries, and to know whether or not the inclusion of the complete card did all that it is supposed to do for the libraries." Another qualification, in which many joined, was "On balance, we would be glad to cooperate on a permanent program as long as all books were included, and the program was subscribed to by the majority of the leading publishers." Still another qualification was "We would be willing to participate on a permanent basis--assuming the excellent service and efficiency during the experimental period can be maintained." Certain types of publishers were impelled by special considerations. A university press wrote: "Since perhaps the major portion of our books find their way to libraries, Cataloging-in-Source would seem particularly appropriate" and this was also the feeling of the publisher who replied: "Since we publish medical and scientific books, they are often used as reference works and therefore your service seems to be very helpful."

Some firms were willing to participate in a permanent program only to a limited extent. One would be glad to cooperate "where we feel that the book involved has special importance to libraries." Another would participate only if authors' birth dates were omitted and yet another only "when schedules are not tight." Others would cooperate only if problems they had encountered during the experiment were solved.

A small number of publishers expressed an unwillingness to participate under any circumstances. One large publisher of technical works wrote: "To be honest with you, I must say that we would not be in favor of having this system become a requirement in all books which we publish. Nor would we want it to become so generally established that its use would be expected by practically everybody, as is the inclusion of the catalog card number." A general publisher stated: "Our firm would definitely prefer not to continue the Cataloging-in-Source project, for reasons of design alone. We think it detracts greatly from the appearance of the book" and a university press responded: "We do not recommend a permanent program as the publishers' participation would be costly in actual expenses incurred and even more seriously in overhead."

Nevertheless, the great majority of publishers expressed a willingness to cooperate in a widely-adopted program which had been demonstrated to be of major usefulness to libraries.

Meeting with Publishers

In December 1958 the Librarian of Congress appointed a small committee of publishers to advise the Library of Congress on design and production problems in connection with the Cataloging-in-Source experimental project. It was originally planned to have a meeting of the committee in the Library in February 1959 but this meeting was postponed because of the belief on the part of some members that the committee was not sufficiently representative of all points of view and should be enlarged. Accordingly, several additional persons were appointed to the committee, New York City was selected as a more convenient meeting place, and the meeting was rescheduled for May 1959. Those in attendance, in addition to three members of the Library of Congress staff, were as follows:

Seth M. Agnew, Production Manager, Doubleday & Co.
Emmert W. Bates, First Vice President,
American Book Co.
D. F. Bradley, Vice President, Harper & Bros.
Mrs. Margaret E. Cooley, Book Editor,
Library Journal, R. R. Bowker Co.
Roy B. Eastin, Executive Officer,
U. S. Government Printing Office
Sidney R. Jacobs, Vice President in Charge of
Production, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
Faulkner Lewis, Vice President and Production
Manager, Macmillan Co.
George M. McCorkle, Vice President,
Charles Scribner's Sons
Irving B. Simon, Production Manager,
Grosset & Dunlap
Henry H. Wiggins, Executive Editor,
Columbia University Press
John W. Wight, Staff Vice President,
McGraw-Hill Book Co.

It was not found feasible to assemble a completely representative group of publishers but those invited were believed to constitute a reasonably representative cross section of the major publishing interests, with an emphasis on the large trade publishers as being those most likely to be affected by Cataloging-in-Source.

It was emphasized, however, that those present were not invited to attend as official spokesmen for their firms nor were they asked to commit these companies or the publishing industry in general in any way. Their advice and counsel was sought solely in their capacity as experts on the problems involved.

The discussion at this meeting covered, for the most part, the topics dealt with in the letters analyzed above. Particular attention will be given here to comments not already covered.

It was mentioned that the Library of Congress had entered into Cataloging-in-Source strictly as an experiment and had done so in large part because of the encouraging responses made to Andrew Osborn when he first discussed the feasibility of the basic idea with a large number of publishers. It was further explained that the Library was not attempting to promote Cataloging-in-Source but was interested in discovering the problems involved, in ascertaining whether such a program was desired by libraries and publishers and, if so, whether it would be successfully executed.

The basic question as to whether Cataloging-in-Source was worthwhile from the publishers' point of view was raised, and mention was made of tight schedules and additional costs. An officer of a major publishing house which had not taken part in the experiment stressed the cost of coordinating all the procedures involved in Cataloging-in-Source in a large firm with numerous departments. He estimated that full participation by his company would require the services of one additional clerk and that the mechanical costs would amount to between $30 and $40 per title or a total of $15,000 a year, exclusive of overhead. He could not see any measurable return for this expenditure and expressed a wish for additional proof as to the value of Cataloging-in-Source from the publishers' point of view. He hoped that it would result in the sale of enough additional books to repay publishers for their increased outlay. Another member of the group questioned whether libraries would actually use the cataloging information provided for them and might not prefer to continue their purchase of Library of Congress cards.

The representative of a large firm which had participated extensively in the experiment reported that it had cost only $10 per title for the setting of the catalog entry, the file copy of the page proofs had been sent to the Library of Congress for cataloging, no additions to the staff had been necessary, and no significant delays had been encountered. He favored Cataloging-in-Source and believed that as a permanent program it might hope to attain a nearly 100% coverage over a period of two years.

Others were of the opinion that the percentage of errors would increase under a permanent program involving a larger number of titles. Some thought that such a program would present particular difficulties to the publishers of technical works. Publications prepared from sheets imported from abroad were mentioned as a special problem and it was noted that proofs are frequently not available for fiction, juveniles, and a large number of the publications which are printed by offset-lithography. Estimates as to average additional costs per title varied considerably. Some of the figures mentioned were $10, $15, $20, $30, and $40. Some of those present were unwilling to make an estimate, believing that the cost would vary widely according to the size and character of the book.

It was agreed that scheduling was the most serious problem to be faced. This was particularly true as regards the large trade publishers and the university presses. Small firms and firms specializing in religious publications had not found this to be such a serious problem.

One member of the group, who had not participated in the experiment, thought that more publishers would cooperate if their part in the program could be simplified and the requirement that page proofs be sent could be eliminated. He questioned whether the sending by publishers of the front matter, including table of contents, and a full description of the book would not suffice. It was explained that this would suffice for most purposes but would not permit verification or allow complete accuracy in the assignment of classification and subject headings.

It was also suggested that the catalog entry be prepared by the publishers themselves or in a Cataloging-in-Source office in New York City but it was agreed that this is not possible under the terms of a system based on uniform standards. A New York office would have advantages for expediting purposes, picking up proof sheets from publishers, sending them to Washington, and returning them in a minimum amount of time but for a standard catalog entry, cataloging at the Library of Congress would still be necessary.

In general, the publishers at the meeting who were most favorable toward Cataloging-in-Source were those who had participated in the experiment. Opinion as to its practicability and feasibility as a permanent program was rather evenly divided. There was general agreement as to the number and seriousness of the problems which would have to be solved before such a program could become a reality.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The theoretical arguments for a permanent full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program have long been apparent. There are three principal arguments for such a program. The first is the immediate availability, in the book itself, of a full catalog entry and the consequent possibility of getting the book into the hands of a reader at an earlier date. The second is the prospective saving in costs to libraries through the elimination of some operations, such as the ordering of catalog cards (Library of Congress printed card numbers have now been appearing for some years in the books of most trade publishers), and the simplification of others, including the searching of gift items, checking and recording operations in order work, listing, preparation for binding, reporting to union catalogs, and interlibrary loan, thus making possible the transfer of some functions from professional to clerical staff and the freeing of the professional staff for increased service in other areas. The third is the possibility of bibliographical standardization of entries in such listings as the Cumulative Book Index and the Publishers' Weekly, in reviews, footnotes, publishers' and dealers' catalogs, and the like.

The theoretical arguments against a permanent Cataloging-in-Source program are equally apparent. These might be expressed in terms of questions as follows: 1) Would publishers be able and willing to cooperate in a full-scale program? 2) Could the Library of Congress, or some other central source, catalog all titles from page proofs with sufficient speed and accuracy? (It is obvious that there would have to be a central source since uniform catalog entries could not be prepared by the individual publishers). 3) Would the utility of Cataloging-in-Source to libraries actually be as great as has been claimed? 4) To what extent would libraries substitute a new set of time-consuming routines (e.g., evaluating accuracy of cataloging information, adapting data to local conditions, operating a camera) for previous procedures at no real gain? 5) Would not the obsolescence of catalog entries prove to be a major drawback? (Names and subject headings could not be changed in the books themselves but would have to be changed in the card catalog). 6) Can and will a successful and economically attractive camera become available? 7) Might not a less costly program attain the same objectives?

The Cataloging-in-Source experiment provided a partial answer to some of these questions. It demonstrated that with a reasonable amount of effort over a period of several months more than 150 publishers could be persuaded to cooperate in a temporary project by forwarding page proofs, along with specification data sheets, for a given number of their titles. It further demonstrated that the Library of Congress could, with the aid of a foundation grant, catalog over 1,200 titles from page proofs during the experimental period, performing this task with adequate celerity but with a high incidence of discrepancies between the printed catalog entries and the books as finally published and at a prohibitively high cost.

Because of the temporal and fiscal limitations under which the experiment necessarily operated, the libraries visited during the Consumer Reaction Survey had not, for the most part, had an opportunity to examine any considerable number of the titles which had received Cataloging-in-Source treatment. This makes it impossible to answer with certainty the questions as to the actual use by libraries of Cataloging-in-Source information or the dependent question as to justification of the program in terms of utility versus cost.

The final question as to possible alternatives can now be considered in more specific terms in the light of developments which have transpired since the conclusion of the Cataloging-in-Source experiment.

It remains, therefore, to consider whether a permanent, full-scale program of Cataloging-in-Source would be practicable from the point of view of technical considerations, financing, and utility. This topic will be considered from three angles: the publishers, the Library of Congress, and the consumers.

The Publishers

A reading of the previous sections should make clear that to secure the cooperation of all or of a majority of American publishers would require an intensive effort by a full-time staff over a considerable period of time. During the summer of 1958 some 300 publishers of various types were visited.

A total of 244 agreed to participate in a limited experiment but only 157 firms and agencies had actually forwarded page proofs when the experiment ended.

Some of the largest companies declined to participate on any terms, others withdrew their offers of cooperation before the project actually began, and still others, after a brief experience of participation, determined not to continue in the experiment. The reasons for this reaction were described above. They are chiefly the interruption of production schedules, additional costs, probably averaging $15 per title or $450,000 for 30,000 titles a year, and doubt as to the extent to which libraries would actually be benefited. It would require a great deal of persuasion to overcome these objections and a convincing demonstration of major benefits to libraries not attainable in any other way.

For a permanent, full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program to work satisfactorily it would be necessary for a majority of publishers to lengthen their production schedules, an expensive proceeding at best and one probably not achievable in the case of publications with very tight schedules. In the larger companies with a number of departments it would probably be necessary to add a person to the staff to coordinate all the additional procedures involved. Publications produced by offset-lithography, a rapidly increasing category, would have to be forwarded for cataloging in a facsimile of the camera copy. Present problems of design and placement would have to be solved and additional space provided for the cataloging entry. Some elements of the existing catalog card, such as the author's dates, the use of real names instead of pseudonyms, and some subject headings would continue to be objectionable to many publishers. Nor could it be expected that the catalog entry would be uniformly printed in the exact format of a catalog card. This would mean that entries not in this format could not be directly transferred from the printed page to a catalog card by photographic methods, even if the necessary camera were available at a price which most libraries could afford.

The Library of Congress

The experiment demonstrated that the Library of Congress, with the aid of a foundation grant and a great deal of overtime,

could, by an extraordinary effort over a short period of time and at the sacrifice of other work, catalog from page proofs and specification data sheets an average of 11 titles per working day and as many as 18 titles on peak days. It is estimated that a permanent, full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program would require the cataloging of 30,000 titles a year. This total would include all U. S. trade publications, Federal and State documents, and other non-trade publications. It is further estimated that 2,000 of these titles would be publications which the Library of Congress would not otherwise have cataloged, chiefly additional analytical entries and some additional entries for serials. This would mean an average of 120 titles per day for 250 working days and considerably more than this number on peak days during the height of the publishing season.

To meet the needs of publishers these titles would require non-stop rush handling from the receipt of page proofs and data sheets through all the various stages until the mailing of the catalog entries to the publishers. This, in turn, would require an organization of effort similar to that under which the U. S. Government Printing Office produces the daily Congressional Record during the sessions of Congress. With a sufficient staff, most titles could probably be cataloged within a 24-hour period but not all of them and as a safety factor the time allowed for handling should be extended to 48 hours from receipt to mailing. The additional staff would require space which is not now available and will not be available for years to come.

To execute such a program would probably cost the Library of Congress between $250,000 and $300,000 a year. This would include a new expediting office, additions of professional and clerical personnel to the present staffs of the Descriptive Cataloging, Subject Cataloging, Catalog Maintenance, and Card Divisions, and Decimal Classification Office, and increased printing costs.

For effective day-to-day liaison with publishers it would probably be necessary to establish and maintain field

offices in New York City, Chicago, and on the West Coast and to appoint a traveling representative who would periodically cover other areas of the country. The New York office would require a minimum of 4 persons and the other offices at least 2 persons each. The requirements for rent, communications, and travel would also be substantial.

The earlier pages on cataloging and the statistical appendixes abundantly demonstrate that because of last minute changes in publications on the part of the publishers, catalog entries prepared from page proofs can never attain complete accuracy of description. The percentage of discrepancies could undoubtedly be reduced over a longer operating period but could never be entirely eliminated. This would entail the careful checking by libraries of each catalog entry against the book itself and if discrepancies were found would render impossible the direct copying of the entry by photographic methods, even if the entry were in the exact format of a catalog card, which would frequently not be the case.

The findings of the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey also reveal the overwhelming extent to which libraries would adapt the catalog entry to their local requirements rather than using it as given. Because of this factor of adaptation it is apparent that even entries in the format of a catalog card and without any errors would not be used as they stood. They would merely provide cataloger's copy in lieu of a preliminary entry. Libraries with suitable photographic equipment might copy the entry from the book but they would then paste over certain items and add others, such as call number, additional author information, alternative or added subject headings, notes, and the like. The adapted card would then have to be rephotographed and reproduced in a sufficient number of copies to meet the library's needs. The same considerations would prevail in the case of libraries using cataloging data sheets and reproducing their cards from stencils. This reduces the utility of Cataloging-in-Source to the provision of cataloging information which would be checked, adapted, and then used as the partial basis for an individual library's own catalog cards and this, in turn, raises again the basic questions as to whether such a program could be justified in terms of its very high cost to both publishers and the Library

of Congress and whether the information provided could not be made available in some other way, at a lesser cost.

The Consumers

The Consumer Reaction Survey made plain the desire on the part of a representative group of American libraries for Cataloging-in-Source information in the books they will acquire but, because of its necessary limitations, it did not present any clear-cut evidence as to the savings which might be effected. The survey also produced a wide divergence of opinion as to the extent to which the information would be used and the ways in which it would be employed. A large number of the libraries surveyed reported that they would continue to purchase Library of Congress or H. W. Wilson cards. This preference for printed cards ready for use after any necessary adaptation and prepared with a high degree of accuracy from publications in their final form, is quite understandable. Where cards are available with reasonable promptness it obviates the necessity for their preparation by individual libraries and this advantage must be given due weight. The concurrent operation of both the printed catalog card and the Cataloging-in-Source programs would obviously be wasteful.

A Cataloging-in-Source program confined to American titles, the only possibility at the present time, would not meet the principal need of the research library. On the other hand, the cataloging each year from page proofs of 30,000 American trade and non-trade publications and Government documents would be in excess of the needs of the great majority of libraries. The major requirements of most smaller libraries could probably be met by the cataloging of from 4,000 to 5,000 commonly-held titles a year. Cards should be available on or very shortly after publication date for most of these from the H. W. Wilson Co. or the Library of Congress. In the fiscal year 1958-1959, under the "All-the-Books" program, over 2,000 publishers, 400 more than in the previous year, sent approximately 12,000 publications to the Library of Congress, the majority of them in advance of the date of issue, and they also printed the Library's card numbers in the books themselves. Publishers have also been encouraged to deposit their books

in the Copyright Office with greater promptness than in the past. An increasing measure of cooperation on the part of publishers and continuing efforts on the part of the Library of Congress should mean that cards for an ever larger number of books will be available by the time the books themselves are received.

Conclusions

Several conclusions seem obvious from all of the above points of view. A permanent, full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program would be a very expensive operation which might cost publishers and the Library of Congress $750,000 a year or more. Because of the very nature of the publishing industry, with its rigid production schedules, rush titles, and last minute changes, it would never be possible to obtain for all publications page proofs and data sheets which completely and accurately represented the book as of the moment of going to press. Divergences in the format of the catalog entry as actually printed would make it impossible in a large number of instances to use a photographic copy of the entry for the direct production of catalog cards. The inevitably high number of discrepancies between the entry and the completed book would require the careful checking by libraries of each entry with the book itself. The need for adapting entries to meet local needs would mean that the entry would be used only as raw material for a library's own entry. In view of these considerations the over-all conclusion seems inescapable that a permanent, full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program could not be justified from the viewpoint of financing, technical considerations, or utility.

Possible Alternatives

It has been suggested by the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee that the Cataloging-in-Source entry might be reduced to the elements of author, classification number, and subject headings. This might reduce the cost of the operation to the Library of Congress but it is doubtful whether it would greatly reduce the cost to publishers. It would still require an additional operation on their part

and a lengthening of schedules for many titles and it would still be impossible to insert the desired information in books with very tight schedules. The problems of coordination of procedures in the larger companies, of offset publications, design, and placement would remain, if in a diminished degree. There would continue to be objections to the use of dates for living authors, to real names instead of pseudonyms, and to certain subject headings. It might be even more difficult to overcome these objections and to persuade publishers that the printing of a radically reduced catalog entry would sufficiently benefit libraries to be worth the additional expense, interruption of schedules, and annoyance it would cause them.

The Library of Congress would still be required to catalog 30,000 titles a year or 120 per working day by non-stop rush methods and to include in the annual output several thousand titles to which it would not otherwise have given author and title treatment. The elimination of all descriptive elements except for the author from the catalog entry might reduce the expense of some operations but the divergent treatment would introduce new and costly complexities into an already highly complex system. The number of errors in main entry, subject headings, and classification, insignificant in the carefully controlled experimental cataloging of an average of 11 titles per working day, might reasonably be expected to increase under a permanent, full-scale program involving the rush cataloging from page proofs of an average of 120 titles per working day.

Since libraries would continue to adapt the Cataloging-in-Source subject headings and classification symbols to meet their particular needs, they would actually be provided only with a useable main entry and even this would be subject to change, depending on the fullness of the name, provision of dates, and choice of entry, particularly as regards corporate authors. The provision of this information would undoubtedly be of assistance to the individual cataloger but the final question remains. Can it not be provided through some less costly method for a number of titles sufficient to meet the needs of most libraries?

Publishers Weekly

Before answering this question careful consideration should be given to the plan originally announced by the R. R.

Bowker Co. in the August 1959 issue of the Library Journal (p. 2265), put into effect with the November 9, 1959 number of the Publishers' Weekly, therein described on p. 23, and more fully explained in the Library Journal of November 15, 1959 (p. 3538). The account in the last-named publication is as follows:

THE News

"Publishers' Weekly" to provide full cataloging in its Weekly Record of new books

LIBRARIANS who order from the PW "Weekly Record" listings can also catalog from them under a new plan proposed by Robert L. Kingery of the New York Public Library and worked out between Bowker and the Library of Congress. In fact, Mr. Kingery expects to prepare both his order forms and his catalog cards directly from the PW entries by photographic methods. The new style of entry made its first appearance in the PW of November 9. To the information previously given (including LC card number) has been added the Dewey number and the LC subject headings. A typical entry looks as follows:

LAYTON, William Isaac. 510
College arithmetic. New York, Wiley [c. 1959] ix, 200p. diagrs. 22 cm. 59-14123 3.50
1. *Arithmetic—1901-* 2. *Algebra*. 3. *Geometry*. I. *Title*.

A review of elementary principles of arithmetic and some topics from algebra, commercial arithmetic and geometry. For students entering college without the necessary mathematical understanding and skills for handling the quantitative problems that arise in daily affairs. The author is Professor of Mathematics and Head of the Department at the Stephen F. Austin State College at Nacogdoches, Texas.

To make the plan work (and incidentally to expedite the production of LC cards for users generally), John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department of the Library of Congress, and Alpheus L. Walter, Chief of LC's Card Division, have made arrangements under which Bowker is to rush its advance review copies to LC in every case where Bowker gets a book before LC does. LC will return book and cataloging by the fourth day. In the Bowker offices, PW's Booklisting operation, under Jessie Kitching, will add the usual descriptive note, and endeavor to print the listing in the week of the book's publication. It is expected that close to 15,000 books will be so listed in 1960.

MONTHLY CUMULATIONS

Beginning in January 1960, the full listings appearing in the PW "Weekly Record" will be cumulated, arranged by Dewey classification, indexed, and made available monthly in the form of a new publication to be entitled the "American Book Publishing Record." Each issue will cover the U.S. book output of the month past. It is expected that many university and research libraries will want to supply this new monthly to key department heads both to help them keep up in their fields (the Dewey arrangement will make this easy) and to help them help the library in its book selection.

The weekly and monthly services, taken together, will quite closely parallel the British National Bibliography, and incidentally the Austrian National Bibliography. In fact, the new monthly "American Book Publishing Record" stems directly from a suggestion made by Dr. Alois Kisser, Acting Director of the Austrian National Library, to Daniel Melcher of Bowker, during the International Conference of Book Publishers in Vienna last Spring.

Dr. Kisser said his specialists enjoyed scanning national bibliographies arranged by Dewey, but resented the time required to ferret out items in their fields from the U.S. bibliographies. They could not understand why the U.S.A., the home of Melvil Dewey, was alone among the great nations in not having a current national bibliography based on Dewey classification. They urged the nation that had produced the world's best buying guides, the CBI and "Books in Print," to supply in addition to the buying aid needed by booksellers and order offices, the selection aid needed by specialists trying to keep up with their specialties. This expressed need the new "American Book Publishing Record" will be designed to meet.

This new program, if it is successful, should attain, as far as the great majority of American libraries are concerned, most of the objectives of Cataloging-in-Source and at a minimal cost. Libraries in this country purchasing any considerable number of books certainly receive the Publishers' Weekly. (Seventy-five percent of its over 16,000 subscriptions are held by libraries). When the plan is in full operation, they should find there for each title in the week of its publication a Library of Congress catalog entry, an entry which is prepared from the completed publication itself rather than from more or less final page proofs. Though not in the exact format of a catalog card, it will contain all the essential information and it can be copied by any methods which may be available to the individual library. Copying cataloging information from a weekly listing would seem to offer as many possible savings as copying from the book itself and there would be the additional advantage of having the cataloging information before the book is ordered and in hand. This would be particularly true for libraries continuing to order Library of Congress cards. The entry will also carry an annotation, prepared by the staff of the Publishers' Weekly, describing the book. This will make it possible, as noted in the Library Journal account, to order a title and at the same time prepare a catalog entry for it from the same issue of the Publishers' Weekly.

Libraries ordering books in advance of publication will also be benefited since the Publishers' Weekly and the Library Journal will send to the Library of Congress all the titles they receive in advance of their publication dates which have not already been sent to the Library by the publishers themselves under the All-the-Books program. This should make it possible for libraries ordering Library of Congress cards to receive them, in the great majority of instances, on or before the dates on which the books themselves can be released for circulation.

In addition, libraries will continue to find in the Library Journal advance listings of new books, with Library of Congress card numbers and authoritative reviews. Thus it will be possible to order Library of Congress cards concurrently with the advance ordering of new titles.

Finally, in the Bowker Company's plan for cumulating the Publishers' Weekly entries into the new American Book Publishing Record, a long step will have been taken toward the goal of bibliographical standardization, since it may be expected that the catalog entries will be increasingly utilized in listings, reviews, dealers' catalogs, and the like. The Publishers' Weekly is expected to list 15,000 publications during 1960.

SACAP

Another promising new development, and one designed to be of assistance in both acquisitions and cataloging, was recently announced by Bro-Dart Industries under the title of SACAP (Selection, Acquisition, Cataloging, and Processing). It is described in the Library Journal of December 15, 1959 (pp. 3828-3830). Under the first stage of this program, subscribers would receive each week individual six-part multiple copy order forms, carbon interleaved, for all books to be reviewed by the Library Journal, in advance of, or coincident with, the appearance of the reviews themselves. Each order form would be reprinted with the author's name, title, publisher, place and date of publication, Library of Congress card number, list price, and an indication of category (fiction or non-fiction, adult or juvenile, etc.) The Library Journal review would be imprinted on the back of the last copy of the order form. Under the plan, one copy of the form would be sent to a book jobber, another would be used for ordering Library of Congress or H. W. Wilson cards, others in the pending order file or for branch distribution, and the final copy, on heavier stock, as a temporary catalog card. The service will include nearly all of the 4,100 books per year reviewed by the Library Journal and is scheduled to come into operation in April 1960.

Under the second stage of SACAP, subscribers would receive for each title ordered a card-format stencil prepared from a standard Library of Congress printed card. These stencils would be paper offset masters suitable for quantity reproduction when used on any of the several types of offset printing equipment now owned by libraries. The company also announced that, for the benefit of libraries lacking these facilities, it is developing a low-cost hand operated card imprinter utilizing the principles of offset printing. The tracings that appear on the usual Library of Congress card would be printed on the SACAP master stencil in such a manner that they could be used as subject headings during the reproduction process.

Conclusion

In the light of the experience gained through the experiment, it is concluded that neither a full nor a partial Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable. The Publishers' Weekly and the SACAP programs have suggested methods by which the potential promise of Cataloging-in-Source might be realized in a much more economical way. There should be no further experiments with Cataloging-in-Source. If the new programs fail to meet their objectives, future experiments should be conducted along the lines these programs have laid down.

John W. Cronin, Director
Processing Department

PART II

THE EXPERIMENT FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF THE CONSUMER

There follow the report of the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey and the recommendations of the American Library Association's Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. These documents are here reproduced as presented to the Library of Congress.

THE REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE CONSUMER REACTION SURVEY

Is Cataloging-in-Source Desired?

Is Cataloging-in-Source needed and would it be utilized? The overwhelming response was "Yes," "Definitely," "Emphatically," and "Indeed yes." From the time of the first announcement of the project and from every person encountering news of it or finding a card in a book the interest and excitement has been tremendous.

The precept and the project caught and held the imagination. Voluntary expressions included: "We're waiting for you to start," "I wish I could express how much we want it," "It's stupendous - hope it will become a reality," "Most strongly in favor," "The ultimate goal is good," "I feel confident... that for every one letter you may receive, you should presuppose at least 25 more - that other busy librarians do not find time to write," "I think it is a fine thing," "I am very enthusiastic," "My only complaint against CIS is that all books do not carry the information," "You cannot know what a help it was," "Let's expand CIS to more publishers and more books," "I think this step is long overdue," "Nothing but good coming from it," "I just can't say enough for it," "It will put a floor under all libraries," "All use would grow if we had it," "CIS would move the profession forward," "The need for such a service is vital, and we must keep it going," "We certainly hope it can be a continuing project," "The immediate effect is to our advantage and the long run is even more important," "I only wish it could be more inclusive," "We plead for its continuance," "This is almost like having the services of an extra librarian on our staff," "We cannot endorse too strongly the inclusion of this information in the books we buy."

And the service has been "wonderful," "essential," "the answer to a great need," "one of the most forward advances the library profession has made in years," "one of the biggest helps to small libraries that could happen," "an excellent plan," "a wonderful idea," "a very worthwhile project," "the answer to many problems," "a great stride forward," "a tremendous time and money saver," "a Godsend to the harassed part-time teacher librarian," "an exciting and worthwhile development," "a tremendous forward step," and "one of the greatest advances toward simplification and streamlining of work in years."

From its beginnings, the envisioned goals for Cataloging-in-Source have been (a) getting new books to readers faster, (b) cutting the high cost of cataloging, and (c) providing greater standardization in the identification of books. It was the considered opinion of all contacted that such a service would indeed have these effects, but ideas suggested even wider influence. It was felt that every area of library service might be affected, that the influence would reach beyond a given library into interlibrary relations and services, and would reach beyond libraries into the book world generally.

Throughout the Survey, there was an assumption on the part of the majority of librarians that the cataloging information would continue to be that supplied by the Library of Congress. Suggestions that it might be established otherwise (by offices cooperatively established by publishers, by cooperating libraries, by individual publishers or other commercial enterprises) were brushed aside or vetoed. Libraries are accustomed to accepting LC's cataloging because, for many years, its cataloging has furnished a parental roof from which other practices have sprung and to which other libraries return for guidance. Furthermore, machinery is already established making available, through the printed catalogs and the printed cards, information concerning materials cataloged by LC in the past, currently, and in the future. Last, and possibly most important, LC cataloging is built on the firm foundation of long-established and widely-followed authority files.

The exceptions to this reaction were found at the two extremes of library sophistication: at one end, those serving children and at the other end, those serving subject specialists. Most of those working with children (in elementary schools and with the juvenile collections of public libraries) want the materials used by children cataloged and classified for them. Over and over these librarians, while decrying the time spent in ordering and waiting for H. W. Wilson Company cards, said they wished for cataloging "like Wilson's." They want simpler entries, briefer description, shorter and more appropriate Dewey classification, appropriate subject headings, and annotations. This is more than simplification; it is the whole approach. Fictional biography,

for instance, is used with children as biography; and the subject subdivision "Juvenile literature" is unacceptable, both because it's redundant in a children's catalog and because it's unappealing to the child. Conversely, the scholarly user of a legal, medical, chemical, metallurgical, philosophical, religious, or other special collection wants as much information as possible about the bibliographical and authoritative backing of a work, and he wishes the most up-to-date, technical, and specific subject approach. Neither of these extremes is fully served by LC's cataloging; however, that cataloging catches, through the vast middle-ground, a larger group of library users than could any other agency. Further, even these extremes find the LC cataloging and classification helpful as a starting place; it does establish an entry acceptable to most and does give the scope and coverage of the work. Adaptation is far simpler and less time-consuming than doing the work from the beginning.

In reactions to CIS there were possibly only three completely negative responses. One correspondent (the president of a small public library board of directors) evidently anticipated undue outside influence; one (the adult-service librarian of a medium-sized public library) decried the tendency of cataloging to stray too far from the "patron oriented" use; and one feared that, in grasping for this service, we might endanger other proved ones, particularly the sale of LC cards. There were others who saw this and other dangers and gave qualified responses. Those qualifying their enthusiasm hoped that LC would not consider giving up the sale of cards, at least for older titles and foreign books, would not postpone the cataloging of older and foreign books under pressure of current work, that no service would be surrendered until an equally-acceptable new one were available. Even if CIS coverage were adequate, some libraries would give up the printed cards reluctantly because of their appearance; by the same token, many school and small public libraries value Wilson cards for the same reason. A caution recorded once was that of the danger of budgetary officers' assuming that no money need be appropriated for catalogers or cataloging costs because the work was done for them; most everyone, however, recognized the fact that catalogers would be as necessary as ever although possibly more effectively distributed.

But, despite the warnings and the citing of dangers, the vote for CIS was overwhelming approval, possibly as high as 98 or 99 percent. The approval largely persisted even when forced to a choice between CIS and the continuance of card sales. And it is significant that when asked if they would be willing to support the movement with money, almost everyone, even those who had qualified all of their previous answers, expressed unqualified willingness to do so, some saying they'd prefer it to come in a slight increase in price of books, others hoping it would be in the form of definite sums (a percentage of their book funds, for instance), some saying the project should not rest on anything so unpredictable as governmental annual allotments. A few felt that publishers should underwrite it.

Libraries Interviewed for Reaction

Opinions were obtained by means of three general methods: interview, correspondence, and group discussion.

The most intensive study was that using the interview. The five members of the Survey team visited 208 libraries, several bookstores, and other book-oriented firms. With the exception of the 21 individual schools, the library interviews, which took two to four hours, were tied to the questionnaire ("Information Sheets" - see Appendix J) previously received and studied by the cooperating libraries. The form of the interview differed from place to place, the library largely deciding procedure. In many, the Interviewer met with key library personnel (representing reference, circulation, acquisitions, and administration, as well as cataloging) talking in general terms of Cataloging-in-Source and the goal and procedures of the project, and then went over with the cataloging heads the specific information assembled. In some cases the Interviewer met with a group of processing people, reviewing the information sheets and sketching background as pertinent. Sometimes the visitor talked to but one person - the Librarian, the Head of Technical Services, or the Cataloger or Head Cataloger. Many meal meetings had been arranged by the libraries. (The time, interest, cordiality, and graciousness of the librarians cannot be over-emphasized; this would be a story in itself).

From the first, it was felt that 200 libraries would be a fair sampling. Compiling the list began with the 49 members of the Association of Research Libraries; to these were added the 25 largest public libraries and 8 school systems known to have centralized cataloging or processing. Then, working around the geographical locations of these 82, the others were added, making sure that all regions of the country and that the various-sized libraries of each type were represented. Some visits (including those to individual schools and the bookstores) were added as time and opportunity permitted; these, of course, were made without benefit of the questionnaire.

A study of the list (Appendix H) shows it to be somewhat top-heavy, with large libraries out-balancing small ones in number. This does not invalidate the findings for each type of library; it does mean that total figures or comparative figures must be used sparingly. Several small libraries declined to take part because of the lack of staff time and a feeling on the part of the librarians that they were not qualified by experience to give adequate information or opinion. However, many letters were received from small libraries; also, the patterns for school and small public libraries were so quickly set and so closely followed, the picture obtained was a dependable one, even though based on a smaller sampling. It was found, of course, that the larger the library, the more diversified are the processing practices, between one institution and another, and also within each one, thus requiring more cases to establish a pattern.

A breakdown of the list of libraries visited and their processing load follows. The totals for libraries by type are figures from the American Library and Book Trade Annual, 1960, published by R. R. Bowker and Company and, can be used only as approximate figures; they are given here for comparative purposes.

Table I. Libraries Visited

Type of library	Total in U.S.	No. visited	Of those visited no. titles cataloged in year	Of titles cataloged, est. % current Am.
Univ. & College	1,948	75	Range: 600-68,116 Average: 14,995	Range: 10-90% Average: 47%
Public libr. & Reg. centers ...	over 8,000	73	Range:1,700-20,071 Average: 6,482	Range:34-100% Average: 80%
Special Libraries	4,282	31	Range: 272-15,005 Average: 2,939	Range: 6-100% Average: 57%
School systems		8	Range:1,000-14,149 Average: 6,358	Range: 6-100% Average: 78%
Individual school libraries	34,244 (est.)	21* (rep. of 66 schools)	Range: 100-1,500* Average: 661*	Range: ?-100* Average: 100%

*Figures available from schools too spotty or undependable to be conclusive. Several of those interviewed were individuals responsible for many schools. The New York Public Library's Reference Department was grouped with the Universities and Colleges, i.e., as a research library; its Circulation Department as a public library; governmental libraries are included with Special libraries. (See Appendix H)

As to be expected, the research library absorbs the largest number of new titles in a year; the larger the library, the larger the number of titles and also the smaller the percentage of current American imprints. Special libraries also follow this correlation: the larger the library, the more titles and the more imported or older titles. In the public library and school system, however, the larger the system, the larger is the proportion of title duplication. The acquisition of the older and non-American titles increases in the public library as it grows in size, but not as rapidly as the increase in title duplication. In the schools, non-American titles are negligible; and, while older titles are acquired, they are largely in current editions.

Letters, Meetings, and Writings

Letters began arriving as soon as the Project was announced in the LC Information Bulletin and Cataloging Service; a few written directly to the publisher as a result of finding the card in the book also became part of the record; but the most came in answer to the prepared statement which was carried by national and regional library publications and which requested the response (see Appendix L). In all, 212 letters and cards were received, 39 from colleges and universities, 76 from public or state libraries, 32 from schools, 53 from special libraries, 12 from miscellaneous sources (church or seminary libraries, clubs, indexers, etc.) They came from Canada as well as the U. S., and one arrived from Korea.

Regional groups of technical service librarians who generally schedule Spring meetings were contacted; Cataloging-in-Source was suggested as a topic for discussion; and, if possible, speakers were supplied from the Survey Group, from the Library of Congress, or from the members of the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee. Where speakers could not be sent to the meeting, information was supplied to local or other guest speakers. (See Appendix M). There were undoubtedly other meetings where the subject was discussed but which did not get reported. Not only was attendance at these meetings larger than usual (often running well over 100), but also discussion was lively, and straw votes were sometimes taken on questions pertaining to CIS.

The project has inspired writings on the subject, a few on the project itself (for which material was supplied) and some on the history of the idea prior to CIS. Some of these have appeared in print (Appendix N); others are planned.

CIS and Bibliographic Standardization

As stated above, one of the goals of CIS was furthering bibliographic standardization. The assumption that it would do so underlined much of the enthusiasm for the service and much of its anticipated used.

This assumes a great deal. To achieve complete standardization, it assumes that cataloging information would appear in each work published in the United States and, eventually, throughout the world; that the author and title entry so established would be adopted by publishers in their announcements and catalogs; that this entry would be employed in trade and bibliographical publications and in reviewing media; that it would be used by writers and students in preparing bibliographies; that it would be used by the book trade in advertising and billing; that it would be used by all book people, including librarians, in all forms of communication. And it further assumes such Utopias as catalog code agreement (national and international), compromise between bibliographer and cataloger, and acceptance by libraries of some curtailment of immediate patron convenience for the sake of the longer view of uniformity and larger service.

There was much evidence on the part of those contacted (librarians, book dealers, and publishers) that the need was recognized as urgent and that the spirit of cooperation was strong. How wide and how deep the practice would become, only time would show; if begun in good faith, it well might spread rapidly. The value, of course, cumulates with time as well as with cooperation.

CIS Contribution to Library Service in General

The 1,200 titles cataloged in the trial period were not enough to permit experimentation, procedural changes, or statistical measures; therefore judgment, vision, opinion, and imagination had to be employed. People vary greatly in these qualities; however, the blending of all of the ideas paints an impressive picture.

From these ideas it soon became apparent that cataloging information printed in the book is seen as improving all library services. The suggestions (some of which would, in time, undoubtedly prove to be of minor importance; some of which might well prove to be extremely important) would be augmented in practice by others, possibly more valuable than any now envisioned. The suggestions see CIS as improving and spreading present services to the public, providing new services, achieving reassessment of staff assignments, achieving savings in certain processes which in turn mean better service and more money for books.

These ideas are reflected in such comments as "CIS would simplify our work, get the books to the public faster, give us more time for service to the public and in many ways be a great benefit." "I am sure that many benefits not recognized now will come to light if the cataloging in source idea is fully implemented." "With catalogers almost extinct (sic!) it is tremendous help to the librarian turned cataloger." "We could pay as much as $200-300 a year to get it. It would save us much more in time, nuisances eliminated, tedious jobs reduced; it would make staff members more content with their jobs and the public better satisfied because they'd be better served and get the new book faster. I cannot honestly imagine any library not being overwhelmingly eager to get this through and in operation."

There are many stirrings and changes and plans seen and felt and heard throughout the library world; in many of these movements CIS could play an important part. This is typified in the statement, "As we plan for the future, it is imperative that all manner of cooperation and centralization be extended to handle our increased acquisition program. In view of the future shortage of professional librarian man-power, it is not only imperative but mandatory." Or, "If this project is discontinued, the effect on our plans for the reorganization of our cataloging and classification methods will not be disastrous but nevertheless will be serious."

CIS As an Aid to Book Selection and Order Work

Not content with generalities, the Reaction Survey Group endeavored to plumb deeper the specific uses, to try to get from each library as exact answers as possible to the question,

"How will Cataloging-in-Source change your life"? and in doing so, moved into various areas of library activities.

Having the cataloging information in the book for instance, was seen as a help in the selection and acquisition process. It was suggested that where selection is made from books themselves (exhibits, bookstores, book selection offices, materials carried by salesmen, etc.) the subject coverage might be ascertained quickly with the aid of the classification number and subject tracings; also that authority for the work would be indicated by the main and other added entries; and relationships to other works often might be indicated by series, title-change, and other notes. In checking gifts and other automatic receipts, these pieces of information would also be helpful , several libraries suggesting that it would encourage blanket ordering since dealers would be aided in sorting books by subject. In listing and checking new books for selecting purposes (e.g., by branches or schools in a system) the catalog form of entry would facilitate catalog and holdings checking. Exchange lists would be easier to make and to check. When books were received, order records could easily be changed to match catalog entries, thus speeding and simplifying the clearing of order and in-process files. Books, on receipt, could quickly be sorted (by a clerk) for routing to subject departments, or for departmental budget charges, or for review. Feeling was so strong here that many librarians indicated they would prefer American over English editions, regardless of price, for the sake of getting the book with CIS; others said that they would decide between editions of a title, or between titles on the same subject and of comparable value, in favor of the CIS book. For these and other reasons, it was recommended that a list of publishers cooperating with CIS be issued at intervals or that the LC card number carry a symbol indicating that the book was cataloged in source. Another request was that the card carry the list price of the book.

Over and above these aids are those to be gained in this area of work through bibliographic standardization.

If publishers, trade and reviewing publications, and bibliographies followed the CIS form of entry, it was foreseen that order requests might come from selectors with proper catalog entry, order cards could be prepared quickly and correctly with catalog entries, billing and other communication between library and dealer would be clearer, inadvertent "double-ordering" could be decreased or eliminated; monographs in series could be spotted and not reordered if on standing order. Some librarians optimistically foresaw library education of publishers, with agreement on the meaning of edition, for instance, or putting the name of the primary contributor first on the title page. Some even mused that the day might come when antiquarian dealers would use entries comprehensible to the librarian and would list their offerings in subject groupings.

Hopeful of providing some nudging of history on these progressive moves, the Surveyors attempted to get a little more information about buying habits of libraries. The first question was that of timing. The libraries were asked on the Information Sheets: "Estimate to the nearest ten percent of orders placed prior to publication for your library system (exclusive of standing orders)." Answers showed:

Table II. Orders Placed Prior to Publication

Type of Library	Estimate Percentage Ordered Before Publication
University and College ..	Range: 0-25 Average: 6.6
Public	Range: 0-100 Average: 27+
Special	Range: 0-70 Average: 10
School	Range: 0-2 Average: .4 or less

Although the question indicated that all orders were to be considered, there is some evidence that some responses (particularly for public libraries) were based on orders only for titles new to the system; but, even so, it would seem that bibliographical information available close to publication date would be early enough to be utilized for most library ordering.

It is also worth noting that there was little relationship between size of library and pre- or post-publication ordering practice; it was rather a question of the purpose and clientele of each. In general, public libraries and certain special libraries felt the greatest pressure for timeliness; education institutions relatively the least.

The second block of information sought in this area was that of the source of bibliographic information used in acquiring American publications. The libraries were given a list of 12 categories and asked to rank them in order of importance in their usage. Most important was 1, 12 the least, and 2 or more considered equal were to be assigned the same rank; those not used were not ranked.

In order of rank, these categories are (for fuller tables see Appendix I):

Table III. Sources of Bibliographic Information for Ordering American Publications.

(The numbers are the ranking given by each type of library)

	Univ.	Public Liby.	Special	School Systems
1. Reviewing media (Library Journal, Sat. Review, Kirkus, magazines, newspapers).....	2	1	2	1
2. Trade and national bibliographies (PW, CBI, Gov't. indexes, etc.)	1	2	3	2

Table III. (Cont.) Sources of Bibliographic Information for Ordering American Publications.

	Univ.	Public Lib.	Special	School Systems
3. Individual publishers' announcements, ads, and catalogs.....	5	3	1	7
4. Recommendations from individuals (patrons, faculty, staff, etc.).	3	5	4	5
5. Citations in other books or periodicals (other than advertisements).....	7	6	6	3
6. Automatic receipts (incl. unsolicited gifts, exchanges, blanket or standing orders, memberships).....	6	4	5	8
7. Second-hand dealers' catalogs and lists.....	4	7	7	12
8. Salesmen	10	8	10	6
9. Dealer or jobber lists.....	8	9	9	9
10. Book exhibits.....	12	10	11	4
11. Bookstore lists of current pubs.	9	11	8	11
12. Other.....	11	12	12	10

"Other" included LC proof sheets; lists prepared by school authorities, educational agencies, other professional groups or other libraries; interlibrary loan requests; special news stories; educational TV or radio; visits to bookstores or dealers; and Wilson cards received on standing order.

In this question there was considerable confusion between book selection and ordering, particularly in regard to category 4. Many libraries lean heavily on faculty recommendations, for instance, in selecting books to order, but most of them re-check the bibliographical information in CBI, PW, Books in Print, or other publications;

the Interviewers made an effort to straighten this out and restrict the answers to the ordering process.

It should be noted, also, that salesmen play a fairly important part in book ordering for schools or children's collections; very little in adult buying. Antiquarian bookmen might be pleasantly surprised at how much their lists are used; they might be less pleased to know that many librarians said they'd use the lists more if they were more usable -- subject-arrangement, legibility, and using identifiable authors and titles were points mentioned.

Summing up the book selection-acquisitions use may best be done in the words of librarians themselves. Their comments included: "Reviewer can more quickly be sure of subject and scope of book by referring to classification and subject headings." "If we were considering two books on the same subject of about equal merit, we would incline to the one published by the firm cooperating in the project." "Subject headings help to evaluate books." "Approval-ordered books more easily assigned to subject departments." "More of the entries typed on order cards by the public departments should be correct." "Will help to identify reprints which are called 'new editions'." "CIS will help to identify books in series and give proper series entry form." "Changed titles caught, preventing duplication." "The classification and subject headings will serve as annotations and thus cut down in examination" for branch ordering. "It should result in more business-like procedure in the whole book business (publishing, book-selling, librarian, bibliographic research.)" "The CIS entry will enable a non-professional assistant to locate difficult entries quickly in the process file when books are ready for routing slips to be pulled." "Searching for unrequested gifts and temporary cataloging of them by multiple order form easier." "CIS should bring about a decrease in the number of unintended double orders."

CIS and Catalog Card Preparation

When CIS was first proposed, it was believed that carrying the full catalog card in the book would mean great savings both in time and money to libraries if they could reproduce their cards directly from the book. This, of course, presupposes that the catalog information is carried in the conventional form and is free from error. To test this idea, two

types of information were desired: (1) how catalog cards are presently prepared or acquired and (2) how closely LC cataloging is, or would be, followed. These groups of information are possibly the most important - and the most difficult to obtain in usable form.

The story of card production is fantastically complex and is constantly changing. Possibly no one is completely content with his practices, everywhere people are looking for improvement, and they jump from process to process. Libraries were asked to indicate how they are presently acquiring their cards; and since the majority have multiple practices, they were asked to indicate these in estimated percentages. Tabling this complete information is too complex; but a rough picture can be drawn by taking the practice with the highest percentage from each library. Thus, if a librarian estimated he buys LC cards for 45 percent of his books, buys Wilson cards for 20% and does original cataloging for 35%, he is recorded as using LC cards. This is obviously unfair to the Wilson cards - as also is the fact that the sampling is top-heavy in size of library and has far too few schools (Wilson sold some 27,500,000 cards last year, and LC distributed over 35,000,000, according to letters received from the two institutions in December 1959). But with these facts in mind, Table IV can be used to show some relationships.

Table IV. Present Major Practices of Preparing Catalog Cards. (Number of libraries obtaining highest percent of their cards each method)

	Univ. & College	Public Libraries	Special Libraries	School Systems	Schools
Purchase LC cards	51	26	16	-	4
Purchase Wilson cards.....	-	6	-	2	12
Purchase other cards.....	-	-	-	-	-

Table IV. (Cont) Present Major Practices of Preparing Catalog Cards. (Number of libraries obtaining highest percent of their cards each method)

	Univ. & College	Public Libraries	Special Libraries	School Systems	Schools
Prepare with LC copy	11	25	2	-	-
Prepare with Wilson help	-	-	-	3	3
Prepare orig. cataloging ..	13	16	13	3	2

In a supposition question the libraries were asked to give an opinion as to how they might obtain their cards for those books carrying CIS copy. Their answers, in summary, show:

Table V. Anticipated Source of Cards for CIS Publications (Number of libraries)

	Univ. & College	Public Libraries	Special	Schools and School Systems
Order LC cards.....	46	26	21	10
Order Wilson cards.	2	9	-	13
Order other printed cards.....	1	-	-	-
Prepare own cards..	39	35	9	16

(These figures do not balance with Table IV since some libraries checked two sources and some had no opinions.)

This does not prophesy an immediate or radical change in practice. Principal reasons given for not changing were: (1) the absence of a competent card-copying machine, particularly for making less than 10 cards or for reproducing directly to offset stencil or master, (2) the need for an adequate machine cheap enough for smaller libraries to afford, (3) difficulty of getting and keeping dependable machine operators, (4) skepticism about the quality and uniformity of the CIS card, (5) clumsiness of catalog checking from the book itself, (6) objections to markings in the book itself, and (7) necessary variations in cataloging. But, as indicated earlier, when forced to choose, the choice was often for CIS over cards.

Although the enthusiasm for the direct copying of card from book was limited, many people foresaw great assistance to be derived from combining CIS with LC card ordering. Much time would be saved by having the card number in the book, thus eliminating searching for it. Since the number would match the exact card for the edition in hand, it would eliminate ordering cards which are unusable or require extensive changes. And, since the cataloger can see the card and book together, orders could be made for the exact number of cards needed, for instance, if more added entries or analytics were desired.

Several librarians, in the first flush of excitement over the Cataloging-in-Source concept, asked why it couldn't go one step farther and supply cards with the book or supply the card on an extra, possibly perforated, sheet. Aside from the impossibility of these services from the publishers' viewpoint, both because of costs and the mechanics of distribution, the above findings, plus those concerned with cataloging acceptance, put grave doubts on the general usability of such cards. In addition, the most far-reaching uses foreseen for CIS (bibliographic standardization, identification of scope and depth of book, etc.) are defeated by removing the information from the book. In fact, many pleaded that the CIS copy not appear on the inside or outside of the covers which are often lost in pamphlet preparation or in binding.

Again, written comments highlight the card preparation question: "We would be able to indicate the exact number of cards needed instead of ordering by formula," "We do not wish to return,

on a large scale, to the use of typed cards," "We like the recognition Wilson cards have made of our school needs," Would stop buying cards and "use card money for books," Would solve problem of "does LC card fit that book?" "Eliminate filing and searching proof sheets," "Eliminate ordering LC cards and its related clerical work," "Eliminate ordering, filing, and pulling of LC cards," "Save time in searching for LC copy," "We do not follow LC closely enough to photo its slips."

CIS and Cataloging

It is in cataloging (here used to include descriptive cataloging, subject cataloging, and classification) where the greatest impact of Cataloging-in-Source should be felt, the foreseen use swinging all the way from complete reorganization of processing procedures to those libraries who could see for themselves only subsidiary or fringe benefits. The variations depend on many factors: the nature of a library's acquisitions, the nature of the administrative organization of the library itself and of its processing, the pressures of timeliness, the equipment available or required, and the kind of cataloging done -- all of these, of course, dependent upon the clientele and service goals of each library.

The Elementary School Library

Perhaps it is helpful to scan some of the deviations by reviewing a few library situations from the cataloger's viewpoint. One is the elementary school library. To meet accrediting demands or curriculum needs, the school administration may establish a library, that is, set aside one room or cubicle and put a teacher in charge, who, in addition to caring for the library, may be carrying a full teaching load. This teacher-librarian may have as little as two hundred dollars a year (which he may have to raise himself through fines, book fairs, or begging) to spend for everything; he may have access to a typewriter and may have a case for cards. He may have some student assistance or may have interested some mothers in helping. He needs some record of his books, so he starts a catalog. If he has the money to pay for them and has the time to look them up, order them, sort them, and keep a record on their receipts, he may use Wilson cards when available.

Or he may find that it takes no more time to type simple author and title cards, even a few subjects (providing he has a subject authority book) and save that money for books. He requires only the simplest Dewey classification and the simplest of subjects, such as AIRPLANES, ARITHMETIC, AMERICAN HISTORY, CHINA. He probably doesn't use authors' dates because he has neither the time nor the reference tools for looking up the information and because the dates are of minor, if any, use.

Would CIS help this teacher-librarian? Surprisingly enough, it would--very much. Even though he might cut or change the Dewey number to an appropriate one for his use, he would have saved the time of scanning the book and finding the proper place in the Dewey scheme by himself; he might use different subjects, but he would know what the book was about and the approach and scope. And he would have the author's name without having to choose between two or more possibilities or to identify an obscure one; he might change it, preferring a simpler form or a pseudonym, but he most often would use the one given, and, either way, he would feel reassured that he had professional backing. All this he would have without calling the local high school or public library or without copying slips to check at the catalog of one of those institutions. If he uses Wilson cards, CIS information would permit him to make a slip record and book card and release the book for use, confident that he wouldn't have to re-mark or re-prepare after the cards arrive. Further, he has the author's name which Wilson would probably use, so that checking the Wilson lists would be faster and more accurate. (Although Wilson catalogers may occasionally deviate from LC in choice of entries, they keep a close check and deviate only as they feel it is decidedly more appropriate for the smaller library.) Thus this teacher-librarian would be helped; he'd be helped even more if the cataloging information were more like Wilson's.

The High School Library

The high school library is probably older and may have a full-time, trained librarian. And this librarian may have some clerical help in addition to whatever student assistance he can arrange. He may use either Wilson or LC cards. There is some sharp disagreement here among school librarians

over whether it is more helpful to bring the cataloging to the student's easy comprehension level or to train the student in LC usage, thus preparing him to use a college or other catalog. The practice of the local public library may be influential in his decision since the students use both libraries, also since the school librarian often uses the public library catalog and bibliographic tools as aids. Either way, he won't find cards from one source for all of his books, so he may order from both, making necessary adjustments, or may do his own cataloging. In getting his books cataloged, along with helping students every hour of the day (often with study-hall overflow assigned to the library requiring constant supervision) it may take him a year or more to process the books.

This librarian, too, would be helped by CIS. If he uses LC cards, the card number would be in the book and the ordering would be simplified. If he uses Wilson cards, he would be helped in the same ways as the elementary school librarian. Either way, if he wished, he could classify and prepare his books on temporary records while waiting for the cards; it was variously estimated this would make the books available from two weeks to a year sooner. For the books he catalogs himself, he could indicate directions and have a typist prepare the cards; here again he would find his path cleared to the classification, the author entry, and the subject headings. If he had an adequate machine for reproducing cards, he'd save a great deal of time in typing and in revising. He probably wouldn't reproduce copy from the book since he would have to adjust author and added entries to his cataloged collection and he would want to simplify everywhere -- in description as well as entries -- but the main entry or shelflist card could be typed and the others copied from it. Thus, he'd save time and money in not buying printed cards and he'd also have the full unit card for all entries. Such a machine would have to be under a hundred dollars before it could be afforded.

The Small College Library

The small college library probably has a cataloging or processing staff consisting of one trained librarian, a clerk or two, and some student assistance. There is probably but one catalog, although some book collections may be established or

loaned to dormitories or other locations. The cataloging probably follows the ALA Code; LC subjects, Dewey classification, and Cutter author numbers are used. The cataloger probably orders LC cards and, except for "rush" books, holds the books until the cards arrive. He probably adjusts the cards (at least in major items such as publisher) to fit the book and has the headings typed; he tends to order by formula and follow LC entry, description, and subjects; he may add some entries (titles and joint authors, particularly), and he may add some notes, especially for contents or bibliographies. He may make some changes for local customs (particularly if a Catholic institution) in entry, and he will probably shorten or change the Dewey number suggested to meet curriculum or faculty demands, as well as to conform to the cataloged collection. Some subjects may not be subdivided or as specific as LC's, but most can be used. Original cataloging is necessary for perhaps twenty percent of the acquisitions which are about 65 percent American imprints and 50 percent current publications.

CIS would help the cataloger in processing rush books; they could be prepared completely and released on temporary cards. Card ordering would be greatly facilitated since the cataloging would be shown and he could order by number of cards rather than by formula since the card number would be in the book (eliminating searching) and since the cards would fit the specific edition, thus eliminating the cost of buying unusable cards. It would be hoped that LC cards would be available more quickly and for more titles. He might decide to prepare and release all books at once on temporary records, since he'd have the LC form of entry and so would not be faced with the need of re-Cuttering and since the cards would match his temporary cards and insure the latter's removal from the catalog.

If the CIS information were accurate and in traditional form and if he had an adequate machine for copying from the book, he might make all the cards from the book or from the LC catalogs. At present, however, he'd probably not consider change since the printed cards are handsomer than typed ones and also accomodate more information (thus eliminating many second cards), since typing and revising is more costly, and since there is no machine available today for providing the required number of cards which is usually three to ten. Some experimentation is being done with typewriters which punch tape and thus can automatically retype the material, but it is still in the experimental stage, and the resultant cards are still in typewritten form.

The Small Public Library

The cataloging in a small or medium-sized public library is comparable to the college library except that its public is far more diversified both in age and in reading and educational levels, and the pressure of timeliness is so much greater. Therefore, there are probably two catalogs and two cataloging procedures, one for adult and one for children. If it is a one-man operation, the librarian must fit cataloging in with all the other duties; it is probable that, as the library grows in size, the third professional staff member (after the children's librarian) is a cataloger who may, nevertheless, carry other duties, assisting with book selection, order, reference, and circulation. Catalog cards will probably be ordered, Wilson supplemented by LC (with necessary adjustments) or Wilson for children's books and LC for adult. With the LC there will probably be some changes, personal author being preferred to corporate wherever possible, pseudonyms being preferred to real name for current popular materials, foreign entries translated to English, local names brought out, more titles and fewer other added entries made, some subject simplified, more contents notes used, more analytics used, the Dewey number simplified considerably, etc. However, the majority of cards can be used without change. For those requiring typing (extra cards above those supplied by formula or where printed cards are not available) the descriptive cataloging is probably cut to author, simple title, place, simplified publisher's name, copyright date, main pagination, and single word "illus." The cataloging for the children's collection is comparable to that of the school library.

The CIS help here would correspond to that for the elementary school and college libraries; for the juvenile works an author entry on which to lean in searching for Wilson cards or for local card preparation, the scope and coverage of the book indicated by the subjects and classification, etc.; for the adult work, the LC card number provided without search, the tracings showing how many cards would be needed, a dependable entry provided for temporary or rush preparation. Here, again, cards well might be made locally, machine-copied directly from the book or from one typed master card, <u>if</u> there were an adequate, inexpensive machine available. Or, with the CIS help

and without a copying machine, typing all cards might prove to be cheaper than buying printed ones.

The Large Public Library

With increasing size the cataloging complexities increase. The public library establishes branches, departments, bookmobiles, and stations of various sizes and collection depth, some with permanent, some with fluid collections. The cataloging needs of these extension agencies differ from those of the central library which is meanwhile growing into a research library serving students, business, and professional people on a much more highly-specialized level. Those agencies with permanent collections and catalogs must be provided with catalog cards, and for that service necessary records must be maintained, including authority files with cross-reference indications. For those agencies served by fluid collections necessary records must be devised and supplied. Subject headings must be subdivided to make the specific information findable in the large central collections but not so esoteric as to look ridiculous or misleading in the small branch catalog. These demands mean that headings must be more liberally used than does LC in order to bring out facets required by a small library with few books on a subject or with fewer reference tools at the same time providing specific information needed for the central collection. Thus, for a work on the description of life in an Irish county, the name of the county must show for the sake of Central, but the general subject, IRELAND--DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL, must be used for the sake of the branch library with few books on that country.

The large library system (metropolitan, county, multi-county, or whatever) probably buys LC proof sheets for current publications and types copies from the LC catalogs to use as catalogers' work slips, adds subjects and other added entries, adds bibliographic notes (including title changes and history), changes the date to a copyright date (so that the same shelf list can accommodate all printings) and makes its own cards by some offset process which permits the over-printing of added entries, thus preparing all catalog cards completely by machine. But when one agency acquires a

title new to its collection but not new to the system, providing the catalog cards means either maintaining a stock of prepared cards, filing stencils or masters, or typing a new set of cards. Over the whole process there is the constant pressure of getting books into circulation quickly, as close to publication date as possible.

In this situation CIS benefits might be fringe ones. If the cataloging information were in enough of the books, the proof sheets might be eliminated thus eliminating the cutting and sorting and filing of the slips. However, it is much more cumbersome and time-consuming to do the necessary checking against shelflist, catalog, and authority files with a group of books than with a group of slips which can be rearranged by the terms being checked as the work progresses. Therefore, studies would need to be made to see if it were less time-consuming to pull the proof sheet, to prepare a work slip, or to work from the book. Even if the proof sheet system remained in operation, the proper one could more quickly be found by having the entry indicated in the book. Temporary cataloging could be eliminated for CIS materials, and it would be hoped that CIS would speed LC cataloging.

The Large Research Library

The large research library has the double problem of depth and sheer weight of the collection. It has the burden of supplying instructional materials, supplying materials for research, the direction of which cannot be anticipated, and, jointly with others, of insuring the preservation of the world's recorded knowledge and experience. Fitting a call number into an enormous collection or fitting catalog cards into a burgeoning monster of millions means beating all languages into a submissive unity, also restraint in avoiding unnecessary proliferation of cards, extremes of specificity, and considerable recataloging and reclassifying, all the while losing ground against the influx of print. Where the small library must make the most of its few books by bringing out all parts of each, the large library must justify every card it adds; to the small library with ten books on CHEMISTRY, dividing that term is wasteful and misleading; in the library with ten drawers of cards on the subject, the finest of subdivision is necessary.

In the research library where variant editions or printings are multiple, each must be delineated exactly, and bibliographic history relationships shown. To be usable for them the cataloging must be as exact, as full, and detailed as necessary to identify every work and every edition of it. There is a tendency to emphasize author (e.g. keeping all works of an author under one entry form) as opposed to the public library's interest in making the individual title most easily accessible. And continuations and serials are preferably kept as units as contrasted to the public or school library's practice of cataloging under individual parts or under name or title at time of issuance. Classification must also be fine; those following the LC scheme can usually also follow LC classification; those using Dewey often find the LC-suggested Dewey number incompatible in their collections. Nevertheless, most research libraries, including practically all those of large universities, use LC cards, either purchasing all those needed or acquiring one deposit or proof copy and then reproducing additional copies. For this last, Xerox is growing in usage; with that process, one to six cards can be done, even though expensively, directly by the Xerox reproduction process, or, for more copies, Xerox will transmit copy directly to offset master.

Here again, CIS alone might not initiate major changes. Those buying printed cards would continue to do so since there is no copying machine less expensive than Xerox, which only the largest can afford, and since a large part (65 percent on an average) of their acquisitions are foreign or older titles. However, there would be savings which would be cumulative as the idea spreads. Having the entry in the book would mean going to the proper LC card permitting the searching to be done by clerical assistants, and rush materials (or all) could be prepared with temporary cards if the card copy were not yet received. It might prove profitable to catalog immediately certain categories of material, but this would probably not become general practice until the machine question were solved.

It should be pointed out that minor savings or fringe benefits in a large library can equal in time and money the savings achieved through major changes in a small library. Therefore, these terms have to be considered relatively.

The Special Library

In the special libraries the service is to specialists who demand the latest materials in their fields and who want it listed in the most up-to-date, specific, and specialized terminology. The librarians are usually experts in the subject, not always trained librarians, and, in the nature of their work, they must put reference services ahead of organizational ones. The collections may not be large, but since they are focused about a single subject area, the classification and subject headings must be extremely fine to isolate the parts. Many classification schemes and subject lists have been made for these fields, and they are often used in preference to LC or Dewey. However, LC cards are important to the special librarians, particularly in establishing the author entry and in the descriptive cataloging. They may change the subjects or the classification, but they use the full unit cards, would prefer them even fuller in bibliographic notes and information. Since timing is so important, CIS would be of tremendous help. It would give them the proper entry and indicate the subject coverage; books could be cataloged at once with typed cards or on temporary records until cards are received. For the latter the LC card number in the book would save searching for it or typing author and title order. The librarians of special libraries were most enthusiastic over the idea even though regretful that the cataloging couldn't be more explicit.

Cataloging Practices: Summary

Faced with these varying cataloging practices, an attempt was made to find out how much of the provided cataloging information each library could use, and the survey libraries were asked to indicate how closely their present practices followed LC and how much change in order to conform was possible; they were also asked to identify areas which were most often deviates from LC cataloging and classification. It should be said that it was LC full cataloging being considered, not the brief. And it should be emphasized that LC cataloging is ALA practice, since LC follows the ALA Rules for Author and Title Entry and the LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging which have been approved and adopted by ALA. LC practice, then, is ALA practice applied to its own holdings and

its own authority files. Possibly the largest deviation between what is current individual library practice and what is acceptable is that in libraries who now type their own cards or prepare their own from typed stencils or offset masters or by some other reproducing device employing type. The reason is obvious: information which would be left on a printed card or a photo-processed one can easily be omitted in transcription, and it is economical to to so.

Table VI combines the information obtained. In it are indicated the number of libraries now following (as a general practice, not necessarily 100 percent of the time), or willing to follow LC.

Table VI. Libraries Who Generally Follow or Who Are Willing to Follow LC Practice. (Figures represent number of libraries)

	Univ.	Public	Special	School	Total
1. Title transcription....	74	66	28	12	180
2. Place of publication...	75	60	28	12	175
3. Publisher.....	75	61	25	13	174
4. Series note.....	73	60	28	10	171
5. Entry.....	70	64	26	11	171
6. Paging or vol. number..	71	59	22	11	163
7. Illus. information.....	69	60	20	9	158
8. Date of publication....	70	49	28	9	156
9. Size.....	70	54	21	7	152
10. Contents note.....	70	51	21	9	151
11. Other notes.....	58	50	20	8	136
12. Bibliography notes.....	59	50	16	10	135
13. Subject headings.....	68	44	16	3	131
14. Title entries.....	55	47	13	11	126
15. Other added entries....	50	42	12	6	110
16. Classification.....	47	23	9	4	83
*17. Author (Cutter) number.	19	7	3	2	31

*Item number 17 is suspect to the point of being worthless. The phrase "Book or Work Number" was used on the questionnaire, and it proved to be a term unfamiliar to many people. It is known that a few research libraries follow LC classification even to include the author number, but it is most unlikely that there are 31 of them in the country, let alone in this sample group.

Probing further into current practices, specific deviations were identified and checked. These show:

Table VII. Some Deviations from LC Cataloging. (Figures represent the number of libraries checking affirmatively)

	Univ.	Public	Special	School	Total
1. Copyright date always preferred to imprint date.....	19	53	8	11	91
2. Paging limited to Arabic...	20	51	19	-	90
3. Title entries always made..	15	44	11	2	72
4. Size omitted.....	12	38	16	2	68
5. Illus. information limited to "illus.".....	12	38	8	5	63
6. Contents note used more freely.....	17	32	7	4	60
7. Size omitted except for outside.....	6	29	7	8	50
8. Pseudonyms used for current fiction.....	4	41	-	3	48
9. Pseud. preferred to real name when "better known"...	4	41	-	1	47
10. Place omitted	-	34	-	6	40
11. Place & publisher omitted for fiction.....	1	32	-	2	35
12. Personal names preferred to corporate.....	3	24	4	3	34
13. Title abridged in body of card.....	1	20	5	5	31
14. Place and publisher omitted for juvenile books.....	-	26	-	1	27
15. Illus. information not recorded.....	1	13	5	5	24
16. Publisher omitted.....	-	5	-	1	6
17. Other usual local variations	-	-	-	-	-

Among the "other" deviations recorded were the making of added entries for local personalities, giving fuller illustrative information, using more open entries (e.g. for pseudo-serials), preferring the title-page name, and transliterating or translating foreign names, corporate or governmental. As mentioned before,

some of these deviations occur in processing new cards and are completely acceptable on printed cards, e.g. recording size; others, such as preferring copyright date, might well be considered by code revisionists.

To the request to identify cases where the LC main entry was unacceptable, as in all questions where imagination played a large part, the answers were too scattered to be numerically tabulated. However, practices most often occurring include cataloging series under title if distinctive rather than corporate body, using pseudonym or title-page name, adding full personal names if information is available, simplifying form of corporate entry, anglicizing names, entering under symposium rather than sponsor or editor, preferring English to Cyrillic (or other) when both are given regardless of which comes first, using direct form subdivision in entries for British and U. S. Government agencies, more use of form cataloging, popular form of classical or saints' names, eliminating qualifying or identifying phrases from entry except for local conflict (sometimes regardless of conflict), entry of serials under name at time of issuance of publication in hand, using artist as main entry instead of as added entry (or the reverse).

This discussion of deviations requires so much discussion to record the whole story that the weight of the words could distort the thinking if it is not kept in mind that the total of the variations represents a small part of the total cataloging; in actual practice the bulk of LC cataloging is generally acceptable, and all of it is helpful. As one cataloger summed it up: "Naturally, there would be times when we would disagree with the policy, but a bad entry once in a while seems minor when compared to the many benefits obtained from uniformity."

CIS in Direct Work with the Public

Public service librarians have proved to be as enthusiastic about CIS as catalogers, possibly more so since they would regard it as an aid but aren't necessarily looking for revolutionary results. For one thing, they see it as a possible aid in readers' advisory work: the subject tracings in the book

would give a quick survey of the book's coverage while working with patrons; the tracings also would lead directly to other or related material in the catalog; bibliographic information would be helpful in relating the book to other books identifying title variants, series, title sequence, edition history, etc.; the proper author entry and added entries would show authority and responsibility without the librarian's obtaining it from the text or going to the catalog.

Reference librarians see the service as a probable means for great improvement in making bibliographies; writers and students would have the author and title indicated and need not invent them or appeal to the librarian for help. All foresee it as a help in gathering books from the shelves for special exhibits or booklists, also in preparing the booklists (both in selection and the form of the entry). These librarians could see CIS improving published bibliographies, both in subject groupings and in entry form. And, of course, the bibliographic standardization is considered most important. Reference librarians become excited at the idea of catalog entry, bibliographical works, bibliographies or references in books or magazines, and the entry printed in the book itself all matching. Not only would they be saved hours of time in fruitless searching, they could entrust much more checking to clerical assistants, and they would be secure in the feeling that they were giving better service, relieved of some of the frustration of worrying about what they've missed.

CIS and Other Areas of Work in the Library

It has been said by many librarians that if CIS proved impossible every other way, if it could be obtained for government documents alone, it would be a worthy project. Documents librarians (including those who order, receive and check in, catalog, bind, circulate, or do reference work with documents) become incoherent with excitement at the idea of having a "handle" in approaching this material -- one that everyone can use; this, in addition to having series identified, responsibility clarified, etc. Not only would the work dealing directly with documents be made at least 50 percent easier, but the documents people could foresee an improvement in the tools prepared for working with these

publications. There are not words strong enough to indicate how much CIS is needed and wanted in this area alone. And a few pointed out that this is an area where legislation might be possible, making it mandatory.

CIS would also help in circulation work in many libraries, it was felt. If the patron prepares his own charge slip, he could quickly be trained to use the CIS entry. If the circulation agency prepares its own book cards, the author and title would be available without the catalog department having to "dot" or write the information in the work. Wherever records are made in the library (on bookmobiles and other agencies where there is no catalog, where temporary charges are made, where materials are temporarily changed in location) they could be done more quickly, more efficiently, and more consistently even by a non-professional assistant. It was also mentioned that questionable classification might be quickly checked without returning the book to the cataloger (catalogers see this as a mixed blessing!).

In preparing materials for the bindery, information for spine lettering could quickly be determined without reference to the catalog or a cataloger. Serials people could prepare correct checking cards without catalogers' help and could easily locate the proper checking card for the publication in hand. It was mentioned by many that the CIS information would make teaching the use of the catalog or of the library easier, some even seeing the card being printed in the book as improving the status of library work in the public mind (impressing them).

CIS and Interlibrary Relationships

Libraries are in trouble everywhere; rare indeed is the library with money enough and boundaries of responsibility narrow enough to feel that the first covers the second adequately. This has always been true, but it is increasing wildly. With the needs for libraries and library services growing, with publications exploding, and with librarians becoming proportionately fewer and fewer, there is real desperation in the library world. This is probably nowhere truer than in the areas of processing. To plug the most dangerous holes, librarians have

turned to one another for cooperative action. Such has been the purpose of such cooperation from the codification of rules and exchange of cards and information, through interlibrary loans, plans for cooperative acquisitions (on local levels or nationally as with the Farmington Plan), cooperative storage of little-used material, establishment of union catalogs and bibliographic centers, publication of union lists, to cooperative or centralized processing of materials. Cataloging-in-Source can be seen as a strong element in most of these endeavors. CIS, particularly if followed by an earnest spirit of bibliographic cooperation and if spreading to other countries (and there has already been much interest elsewhere) could aid in various ways:

In book communication, especially on interlibrary loan requests and discussion of cooperative acquisition, much time, confusion, and error could be avoided if all parties to the transaction referred to the materials under the same terms and could easily identify editions. Cooperative acquisition could be extended and improved if agents responsible for locating and distributing material had a fast and easy way of determining its subject, i.e., from the classification numbers or subject tracings in the book. The work on union catalogs, in bibliographic centers, and on union lists and indexes would be considerably faster and more satisfactory, both on the part of cooperating library and the center, with more uniformity in cataloging and listing.

The hope, possibly the salvation, of very small public libraries and schools is more cooperative processing. The publication of Public Library Service; A Guide to Evaluation with Minimum Standards (in 1956) and the federal Library Services Act have spurred this movement, and centralized processing centers are mushrooming. Collectively, libraries can afford the necessary cataloging tools, card copying machines, and specialized staff; thus they can get their processing work done better and more cheaply and save the time of their own staff for other work. With cataloging information in the book this work can be greatly accelerated: no time spent in searching for cards or card numbers, establishing entries or determining the subject coverage. (There were also a few who saw CIS as making centralization less necessary).

Materials sent to deposits could be absorbed much more easily if the cataloging of all cooperating libraries matched that of the center and if the information were in the book. And books requested on interlibrary loan could more quickly and accurately be identified at both ends of the transaction if at both ends the cataloging matched. And it would assuredly help the patron who uses more than one library if he found consistency between them.

The Cataloger's Camera

Concomitant to the project on Cataloging-in-Source there is one to try and produce a "Cataloger's Camera" described as "a new kind of copying machine, inexpensive, dry-process, which can reproduce positive copy directly on to catalog cards and capable of reducing or enlarging copy."

Librarians were asked to comment on the need of such a machine and its relationship to CIS. The general reaction was electric, and the general answer was "revolution!" Dry words can't begin to show the excitement or to picture the exploding ideas, but there is no question of its need. If the previous part of this report has been done adequately, there is a thread running throughout of the many spots where efficient planning is halted by the need of such an aid. There is probably complete agreement that the availability of such a machine, if doing all suggested and inexpensive enough to be within the reach of all, would be as far-reaching in its effects as any device since the introduction of the typewriter. It would be utilized throughout the library in innumerable ways, but, surprisingly, not so much for reproducing catalog cards directly from the book -- the original purpose for its design.

There are several reasons for this. First, the card printed in the book would have to be exact in form and completely free from error, and those done during the trial period did not encourage sanguineness on this score. Even if this were possible, there are the problems of obsolescence and of adaptation to the individual library. The many advantages seen in having the cataloging information printed in the book and remaining there also mean that, in so remaining in the book for its lifetime, certain parts, especially the subjects, may not be those in use at the time the book eventually reaches the cataloger. Absorbing a work into a collection means checking

against established entries and classification and adjusting either the old to the new or the new to the old. And, although many local customs can well be eliminated or compromised, a library's duty is, in the final analysis, to its own patrons, be they children learning to read or research physicists. And, further, for library systems wanting multiple sets of cards with added headings machine-processed, the camera would have to transmit copy directly to an offset master. This is not to say that all libraries repudiated the idea out of hand; there were those who could foresee their making their own cards directly from the book if the copy were usable, but not enough to make CIS program and the Cataloger's Camera mutually dependent.

But, beyond this use, throughout the library, there were many uses anticipated, some possibly just as important in saving time and improving the service. These include copying out the cataloging card from book or LC catalogs for use as the cataloger's work slip; replacing worn, damaged, stolen, or soiled cataloged cards; copying cards to establish new branch, departmental, or subject catalogs or shelflists; making sets of catalog cards from one typed or printed copy. It could mean the preparing of catalog cards for branch libraries acquiring a title new to the agency but previously cataloged in the system -- this alone could eliminate as many as six typists in a large system, or would eliminate the maintenance of card stocks or files of masters or stencils; also it means that each card could be a full unit card. Cards could be quickly prepared for reporting holdings to union catalogs or union lists; and it would simplify the revising of subjects or other parts of the catalog by photographing the old cards with the new headings masked in.

The Camera could be used in book selection, e.g., for copying reviews or citations from books, magazines, lists or catalogs; for copying a library review for filing at various spots; and in copying catalog or shelflist cards to be used in selecting books for a new branch or for other book selection projects, such as in a subject field. It could be used in reader-advisory or reference work in preparing book lists or bibliographies. Order procedures also offer uses such as copying order information for lists or catalogs, copying an

order in making a claim, or making a record of a partially-filled order. In circulation work, the Camera could be used to copy registration cards where multiple files are maintained, copying charging records for over-due notices; in reserves work or making new book-cards from old. It could possibly be used in serials, periodicals, or documents work in preparing binding charges, making claims for missing numbers, and making new checking cards from old. It would be extremely helpful in taking inventory, permitting the copying of shelf cards showing missing copies for further sorting and searching.

Some of these tasks could be done by the Photo-clerk, it is true; but the advantages of the Cataloger's Camera would be (1) that no chemical would be required, thus delivering cards which would not fade or curl; (2) that it would enlarge and decrease the copy; (3) that any number of cards could be obtained instantly without the delay of developing; (4) that it would be more portable; (5) that it would produce copy directly on to card stock and pre-cut stock, at that.

CIS and Book Stores

A few book stores were visited by the Surveyors. Most of those interviewed saw help for themselves in the Cataloging-in-Source idea. They felt the classification number and subject tracings might help them arrange their stock; they felt this information and the author entry would help them in preparing book lists or catalogs and in listing their stock for inventory purposes; they thought this information would help the sales force in learning the books and book stock and help the customer in selecting the book he wanted. They hoped it would be widespread and extend to other countries. One spoke of it as "long overdue." Some indicated it would be so worthwhile, publishers should pay for it.

The idea of furthering bibliographic standardization was exciting to them, one commenting that if bibliographic tools and reviewing media used the suggested form of entry, it would be "fabulous." They thought that with some "educating,"

dealers and publishers could learn to use the same entry in billing and in other communication even in advertisements and catalogs. They hoped, of course, that libraries and the CIS cataloging would adopt the title-page name particularly for pseudonyms. One summary comment was, "It can't be started soon enough."

CIS and Current Parallel Services

That there is general recognition of the problems of acquiring and cataloging materials in a library may be demonstrated by citing some of the new services being inaugurated by non-library establishments.

The aids being offered by the Publishers' Weekly in including LC cataloging information in its "Weekly Record" of books published and those of the Bro-Dart Industries in its "Alanar" and "Sacap" plans have been described elsewhere in this publication. In addition, new reviewing digests are appearing such as that of the MB Nubook Cards of Oak Park, Illinois, which supplies cards giving review information, plus grade level and publisher's data concerning children's and young people's publications. A few publishers are undertaking to provide catalog cards, for a small fee, with their books sold to libraries.

All of these movements must be considered in weighing the CIS program; they all hold promise of progress and aid. Not all were announced prior to the library survey on CIS, but general discussion of the needs of the libraries visited were such as to give some opinion as to the aids' equating CIS. In the first place, these various services are restricted in coverage -- to titles listed in Publishers' Weekly or reviewed in Library Journal, to books of one category, or to books of one publisher. These may or may not be ample for a given library. There are costs involved which must be weighed against the amount of work required or saved in a library by having one or more of the services or of having the CIS information in the book. There are, according to the estimates of the American Library Directory, over a thousand public libraries in the country with annual budgets of less than $500 or book funds of less than $100 a year. There are no available figures on school libraries of this size, but there must be several times that many.

To these, even a seven-dollar subscription is a major expenditure. Some of these aids require the matching process, that is, getting the book and the information together; and some would result in the establishment of a new file of order forms or cards or offset masters -- always a step reluctantly taken. And, as indicated previously in this Report, libraries tend to look upon cataloging other than LC-based with suspicion or disfavor.

If all of the services mentioned were available, each library or other book agency would utilize each in the best way for its situation. Rather than eliminating the need for any of them, each may complement one another. Chief arguments for the continuance of the CIS program would appear to be coverage (particularly in regard to the scholarly works and government and other institution publications), the hope of spurring an international movement, and the fact that the cataloging information is always available with the book. This last is the basis for much of the proposed use discussed in this Report.

Conclusions

The only conclusion to be drawn from the Consumer Reaction Survey is that Cataloging-in-Source is indeed wanted, would be used, and is needed.

The first general reaction was enthusiastic and excited approval accompanied by statements extreme enough to picture this as the answer to librarians' problems. Most of those going through the labor of answering the questionnaire and forced to say exactly how and where it would be used hesitated to commit themselves to immediate or radical procedural change, at least in their own cases ("I have special problems.") However they could all see at least subsidiary and fringe benefits, and they saw it as a logical and necessary step in library progress, could whole-heartedly endorse it if not for themselves, certainly for the sake of other libraries and for professional progress in general. All faced the realization that the good would be cumulative; one librarian cool through the whole discussion ended by saying it should have been begun a hundred years ago.

It was generally felt that the three original goals would be furthered. (1) Over and over it was said that books would be available for use sooner; the time saved was estimated from a few hours to a year or more. (2) Although the 1,200 titles cataloged in source were not enough to permit the establishment of new routines or a measurement of savings, enough changes were anticipated (steps eliminated or work assignments transferred from professional to clerical assistants) to contribute to money savings. Even the small or fringe benefits would be numerical enough to total hours and dollars. (3) and everyone seemed to agree that such a service would be a tremendous impetus toward bibliographic standardization.

In addition to these expected gains, librarians were excited about the improvements in library service CIS would make possible. Aside from getting books cataloged more quickly (in itself an improvement in service) it was mentioned that the quality of cataloging would be raised on a national scale, that cataloging practices would become more uniform. The spots of help anticipated in all areas of library work would mean better service in themselves, would mean non-professional assistants could be trained faster, assume more responsibilities, find their work more satisfactory, and require less supervision. This, in turn, would release more of the time of professional librarians for more challenging and more effective work. Catalogers would still be needed to adapt the information to local usage, to catalog those items not caught by the CIS net (a few skeptics feel that the publications where help is most needed such as those of obscure groups or printers, would never be caught), and to organize the procedures. Relieved of many time-consuming and repetitive tasks such as reference work in establishing entries, catalogers could be used more wisely, with their time going farther. They would not be eliminated; their status might change -- and for the better -- by their being taken from the back room and being made a more active part of the library as a whole.

In reviewing the suggested uses of CIS, some parts of the information stand as more valuable than others. To take them, in descending order, they are:

(1) <u>The main entry and title entry</u>. These are basic

to the whole bibliographic standardization concept. Establishing the main entry represents one of the most time-consuming parts of cataloging and the one requiring many expensive reference tools. The form of entry is also that part which would and could be adopted by the most libraries. This is the element which permits immediate or temporary cataloging. Establishing the entry probably is the task taking the cataloger farthest from his desk. Possibly the biggest thorn here is the pseudonym question, with public libraries, publishers, authors, review media, and book dealers wanting the title-page name used, and research libraries wanting the real. Some of the most complicated entries, such as those for foreign government agencies, would not be in a form acceptable to small libraries; however these libraries are not likely to have the publications.

(2) Tracings for subjects. Many uses were found for these. They indicate the coverage of the books to book selectors (personal bookbuyers or library selectors); to people working with the public (book-store clerk or librarian); to those selecting books for displays or booklists; to those grouping books in preparing lists, catalogs, bibliographies; to those sorting books in bookstore or library; and, of course, they give the subject headings or lead to subject headings in cataloging.

(3) The classification numbers. These also serve as a clue to the contents of the book and can be used with the subjects in the uses outlined above, also in arranging books anywhere -- in library, book store, or in a personal library.

(4) The Library of Congress card number. Those libraries ordering LC cards (and until the program gets full and wide expansion, this will be most of those presently buying them) having the number in the book saves time in looking it up and would often be available more quickly than the information elsewhere. It also would eliminate the time-consuming and expensive ordering by author and title.

(5) Tracings for added entries other than subject. These are almost as much of a time saver as the main entry, requiring, as they do, considerable research to discover and assign responsibility and to establish the names. They are also helpful to readers and librarians working with patrons in

showing responsibility and standing of the work. And their establishment demands a large reference collection.

(6) Bibliographical information. This includes the series notes, notes on change of title, all information relating such book to others and giving its history. This again is information not easily available without considerable research and checking, often in tools not held by every library. This is information of considerable value to the acquisitions librarian and to the librarian doing readers' advisory work, not to mention the reader or research worker, the book seller and book buyer.

(7) Price. It was mentioned, particularly by acquisitions librarians, that it would be helpful to have this information, thus making it available to cataloger, book selector, etc., without looking it up each time and without the order clerk supplying it.

(8) Full title transcription, imprint, collation, and illustration information, i.e., all descriptive cataloging items not mentioned above. Some respondents spoke of the value of one or another of these pieces of information. However, it is in these areas that cataloging practices vary most. Further, this information exists as part of the book itself so that reference and recourse to other tools is usually unnecessary. Of course, if any of it is not available in the books, it means a great deal to have it supplied.

The need for the Cataloger's Camera is wide and accute, possibly as great as that for CIS. But the need for CIS and the Cataloger's Camera are not mutually dependent on one another. To quote a written comment, "We would welcome either CIS or the Cataloger's Camera but being put together would increase the value of each."

In summary, the overwhelming response was that we need CIS service and as soon as possible. It would contribute to the library profession, to individual libraries, and to the whole book world. It holds something for everyone, but the degree of revolutionary upheaval depends upon many factors:

Who does the cataloging.
The degree of publisher cooperation.
The degree of library adjustment possible
(e.g., in surrendering individualistic practices).

The degree of international spread (in turn demanding agreement on codes and practices).
The form in which the CIS information is carried.
The timing.
The degree of adoption of author and title entry by publishers, bibliographic publications, and reviewing media.
Success in achieving a cataloging middle ground acceptable to the majority of libraries.
Success in achieving an adequate and inexpensive copying machine.

Ideally, from a bibliographical standpoint, the Cataloger's Camera would come on the market, do everything as specified, and be very cheap. Every published book in the country would be cataloged by the Library of Congress early enough that in all advertisements and publisher's catalogs and in all bibliographies and reviews it would be properly entered, and late enough that a perfect catalog card would be printed in the same location in every book. All catalog codes in the world would agree and all libraries agree to accept them in full. Catalog cards would be machine-copied from the book either to catalog cards or to offset masters, and everyone having any contact with that book forever would use this information as provided. Other countries would follow suit and publish their books with usable catalog cards reproduced within them; and serials, periodicals, maps, record albums, pamphlets, and pictures would follow the parade.

This is a dream. But it is a dream worth thinking about, worth fighting for, and worth moving toward, step by step. For the beauty of the dream is that each part has so much to offer in itself whether or not (or until) the parts become fused.

Esther J. Piercy, Director
Consumer Reaction Survey

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
CATALOGING POLICY AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE CONSUMER REACTION SURVEY
ON CATALOGING-IN-SOURCE

The Consumer Reaction Survey has shown that Cataloging-in-Source is desired and needed by librarians in all types of libraries, in all parts of the United States. In the rounds of the survey, once the idea had been expressed and understood, library after library and person after person contributed to the amplification of the idea and to its practical applications. Cataloging-in-Source has become an objective which should be reached in the shortest possible time for the good of all libraries.

On the basis of the findings of the Consumer Reaction Survey, the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee makes the following recommendations to the Librarian of Congress:

RECOMMENDATION ONE. THAT A NATIONAL PROGRAM OF CATALOGING-IN-SOURCE BE UNDERTAKEN IMMEDIATELY BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, WITH AS COMPLETE PUBLISHER COOPERATION AS IT IS POSSIBLE TO SECURE.

It is recognized that printing catalog information in the book is an expensive and difficult process. Yet it is this single difficult process, once done, that promises extensive savings to thousands of libraries in a single year, and ever accruing advantages to other agencies and to individuals. A predetermined entry by which a book can be listed, advertised, reviewed, ordered, billed, accessioned, and cataloged brings duplication of effort to a minimum. The resulting savings in time and expense benefit publishers, booksellers, librarians and readers. The entry in the book means it is there regardless of the source of acquisition, and remains there for all departments of the library to use in processing and servicing the book; it is always in each copy for all persons who list the book for current advertisements and reviews, for retrospective bibliographies, or for any other reason. A catalog entry separate from the book, either on a sheet or separate card inserted in the book, or the printing of the catalog entry in a separate publication such as in the Publishers' Weekly, re-introduces duplicate checking processes and questions as to entry. All new ventures, such as those of Publishers' Weekly and SACAP, may be highly desirable as services to libraries, but are not a replacement for Cataloging-in-Source.

It is evident from the Survey that Cataloging-in-Source must be authoritative cataloging which meets national standards. The Library of Congress, being the national library which has been responsible for authoritative cataloging used by other libraries both in this country and abroad, is the agency which should assume this responsibility.

If complete coverage of all American imprints is not immediately possible, the program should be implemented to whatever degree is practicable.

RECOMMENDATION TWO. THAT, IF CURTAILMENT OF CATALOGING INFORMATION SHOULD PROVE NECESSARY, PRIORITY FOR INCLUSION OF INFORMATION BE GIVEN TO THOSE ITEMS NOT IMMEDIATELY OBVIOUS IN THE PUBLICATION ITSELF.

The Survey shows that those elements that are of the greatest value to users are: the author entry; the additional entries, both author and subject; the Library of Congress classification and the Dewey Decimal classification numbers; and the Library of Congress card number. It is recognized that a great many libraries either adapt subject headings and classification numbers supplied by the Library of Congress, or use entirely different subject headings and classification numbers. Even for such libraries the inclusion of this information in publications saves time-consuming study of the book.

RECOMMENDATION THREE. THAT PARTICULAR ATTENTION SHOULD BE PAID TO SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS REVEALED BY THE CONSUMER REACTION SURVEY SUCH AS:

(1) Those libraries which will benefit most from a Cataloging-in-Source program are the thousands of public and school libraries whose acquisitions include the highest proportion of American imprints and which lack professional staff and bibliographical tools;

(2) Present Library of Congress subject headings for juvenile literature are in many cases impracticable for the libraries serving children and young people.

Margaret W. Ayrault
Margaret C. Brown
Jennette E. Hitchcock
Paul Kebabian
Bella E. Shachtman, Consultant
Katharine Ball, Chairman.

John W. Cronin served as liaison with the Library of Congress.

January 31, 1960

APPENDIXES

Appendix Page

A "Slips for Librarians to paste on Catalogue Cards"..... 105

B "Plan for Printing Book-titles"..... 107

C Cities Visited by Library of Congress Representatives... 109

D Material Sent to Publishers..... 111

E Cataloging-in-Source in the Department of Agriculture... 121

F Statistics:

Table 1. Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance.. 133

Table 2. Characteristics of Publications Cataloged..... 141

Table 3. Time Required for Cataloging-in-Source..... 142

Table 4. Average Working Time per Entry..... 143

Table 5. Analysis of Errors and Types of Changes Required..... 144

Table 6. Analysis of Position of Entries in Books..... 146

G Sample Formats of CIS Entries..... 147

H Libraries Visited During the Consumer Reaction Survey... 153

I Sources of Bibliographical Information..... 167

J Questionnaire..... 169

K Letter Accompanying Questionnaire..... 187

L Consumer Reaction Survey Press Release..... 191

M Meetings at Which Cataloging-in-Source was Discussed.... 195

N Bibliography..... 197

☞ *Slips for Librarians to paste on Catalogue Cards.*

N. B.—Take out carefully, leaving about quarter of an inch at the back. To do otherwise, would, in some cases, release other leaves.

ROBINSON, E. G. LECTURES ON PREACHING. DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY AT YALE COLLEGE, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1882. By E. G. ROBINSON. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1883. 12mo, pp. 214.

LECTURES ON PREACHING. DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY AT YALE COLLEGE, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1882. By E. G. ROBINSON. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1883. 12mo, pp. 214.

PREACHING. LECTURES ON PREACHING. DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY AT YALE COLLEGE, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1882. By E. G. ROBINSON. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1883. 12mo, pp. 214.

THEOLOGY. LECTURES ON PREACHING. DELIVERED TO THE STUDENTS OF THEOLOGY AT YALE COLLEGE, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1882. By E. G. ROBINSON. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1883. 12mo, pp. 214.

APPENDIX B

PLAN FOR PRINTING BOOK-TITLES

A COMMITTEE of the American Library Association, appointed at the Library Conference in New York last fall, presented its report on a plan for printed title-slips, which we reprint from the *Library Journal*, calling to it the special attention of publishers.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TITLE-SLIPS.

THE Committee on Publishers' Title-Slips report the following plan: (1) For preparing a uniform title-entry, with headings and note, to be furnished to publishers for use in advertising circulars, catalogues, etc., and to journals desiring to use them for book-lists; (2) for furnishing to subscribers title-slips so prepared in shape for immediate use as catalogue cards.

The slip to consist of three parts: (1) The headings, (in nonpareil), including title-heading, if any, subject-headings in order of importance, and class number in decimal system. If these headings overrun, indent the second line one em. (2) The author's name (surname in catalogue-face, *i. e.*, full face, type, given name in plain face, brevier), indented one em, and followed, without beginning a new line, by the title-entry (in plain-face brevier), according to the rules of the Committee on Uniform Title-Entries (see JOURNAL, v. 3, p. 12–20), unindented. If the author's name is not known, the first line is left blank, so that the name may be written in when found. In titles of periodicals, and in any other titles where there is to be no author's name, the first word should go in the catalogue-face type. (3) The note (in plain-face nonpareil) descriptive and explanatory, but neither critical nor laudatory, the first line to be indented one em, the other lines flush.

The type as set is six cm. wide, the measure of the *Library Journal*, PUBLISHERS' WEEKLY, and the great proportion of other periodicals and publishers' catalogues. This is so much narrower than the standard catalogue card as to permit of shelf and other marks on either side. The type should be within five cm. (2 in.) in height, to go on the standard catalogue card. The headings should be set close to the top, so as to get the best light in catalogue drawers.

The samples of slip and titles (given below) will indicate more clearly the style, type and arrangement.

It is proposed to make the New York office of the *Library Journal* and PUBLISHERS' WEEKLY a central office for library as well as book-trade record, but these title-slips will be prepared under the directing supervision of the librarians of Harvard and the Boston Athenæum It is thought essential, both to assure uniformity and to provide that the notes shall be purely descriptive, to have all the slips prepared at some one office of record, under authoritative direction. Publishers will be asked to forward to the office designated the first procurable sheets or an advance copy of each book. The headings, title, and imprint and notes will be at once prepared, revised, put in type, and

Outlines, Art, History (Cook, Cyprus). 709

Lübke, Dr. W. Outlines of the history of art; a new tr. from the 7th German ed.; ed. by Clarence Cook. N. Y., Dodd, Mead & Co., 1878. 2 v., 17+571; 14+695 p. 550 il. Q. cl., $14.

A comprehensive work on painting, sculpture and architecture, for general reading. Covers the beginnings of art; ancient Eastern, classic, medieval, and modern art, with brief chapter on nineteenth century art extended by American editor. An American appendix describes and illustrates the Di Cesnola collection of (Cyprus) antiquities at the Metropolitan Museum, N. Y. The illustrations on wood are profuse, outnumbering those of German original. There are tables of contents and of illustrations, and 25 p. index Lubke is a popular German writer, Professor at the Stuttgart Polytechnic Institute and Art-School. Mr. Cook is art-critic of the N. Y. *Tribune*. The translation is made under the supervision of E. L. Burlingame. Suitable for all libraries.

Current, Questions (Symposium). (This v.) 204
Theology (Soul, Future Life, the whole work) 40
Morality, Philosophy, Church of England, Life, and the names of all the authors).

Burlingame, E. L., ed. Current discussion; the chief English essays on questions of the time. V. 2: Questions of belief. N. Y., G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1878. 10+[1]+360 p. O. cl., $1.50.

Contents. Harrison, F. The soul and future life. A Modern symposium. 1. The soul and future life; by R. H. Hutton, Huxley, Lord Blackford, Hon Roden Noel, Lord Selborne, W. R. Greg, Rev. Baldwin Brown, Dr. W. G. Ward. 2. The influence upon morality of a decline in religious belief; by Sir Jas. Stephen, Lord Selborne, Jas. Martineau, F. Harrison, Dean of St. Paul's, Duke of Argyll, Prof. Clifford, W. G. Ward, Huxley, R. H. Hutton.—Lewes, G. H. Course of modern thought.—Hughes, T. Condition and prospects of the Church of England.—Mallock, W. H. Is life worth living.

APPENDIX C

CITIES VISITED
BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVES

CALIFORNIA
Berkeley
Los Angeles
Palo Alto
Pasadena
Sacramento

CONNECTICUT
New Haven

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ILLINOIS
Chicago
Springfield
Urbana

INDIANA
Bloomington
South Bend

KENTUCKY
Frankfort
Lexington

LOUISIANA
Baton Rouge

MARYLAND
Baltimore
Westminster

MASSACHUSETTS
Boston
Reading

MICHIGAN
Ann Arbor
East Lansing
Lansing

MINNESOTA
Minneapolis

MISSOURI
St. Louis

NEW JERSEY
Newark
Princeton

NEW YORK
Albany
New York City

NORTH CAROLINA
Chapel Hill
Durham

OKLAHOMA
Norman
Oklahoma City

PENNSYLVANIA
Philadelphia

TENNESSEE
Nashville

TEXAS
Austin
Dallas
Houston

UTAH
Salt Lake City

VIRGINIA
Richmond

WISCONSIN
Madison
Milwaukee

APPENDIX D
(Item 1.)

Material Sent to Publishers

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING DIVISION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

SPECIAL DELIVERY

Cataloging in Source

APPENDIX D
(Item 2.)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Cataloging-in-Source
Cataloging Data Sheet for Offset Reprints

1. Original edition being reprinted

   a. Author_____

   b. Title_____

   c. Publisher_____

   d. Date_____

2. Will the reprinted work differ from the original work in any of the following respects:

   a. Number of pages, number or sequence of page groupings, number of volumes ☐ yes ☐ no

   b. Change or deletion of original illustrative matter matter (if any) ☐ yes ☐ no

   c. Size ☐ yes ☐ no

   d. Change or deletion of original series statement (if any) ☐ yes ☐ no

   e. Revision of text ☐ yes ☐ no

   f. Addition of text, half-title, etc. ☐ yes ☐ no

3. If any of the questions in 2 above are answered "yes," please describe changes in detail on the verso of this sheet.

4. Is the title page changed in any respect (other than date)? ☐ yes ☐ n

   If "yes" please supply photocopy.

5. Is the verso of the title page changed in any respect? ☐ yes ☐ no

   If "yes" please supply photocopy.

6. What is the date of the reprint's publication? _____

7. Does this date appear on the title page? ☐ yes ☐ no

8. If not on the title page, is it given anywhere in the work? ☐ yes ☐

Signature:_____

Publisher:_____

APPENDIX D
(Item 3.)

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
Cataloging-in-Source
Cataloging Data Sheet Accompanying

Revised December 1958

Author:_____

Title:_____

1. If title page is not included with material forwarded herewith, give exact transcription of same on back of this sheet.

   In order to insure fully adequate cataloging of your publication you are requested to PROVIDE BELOW DATA NOT CONTAINED IN THE MATERIAL FORWARDED OR IN YOUR TRANSCRIPTION OF THE TITLE PAGE (see item 1 above).

2. Author's full name (if known):

3. Edition statement (but ONLY if it will be printed in the publication): (e.g. First edition, revised edition, etc.):

4. Place of publication: 5. Year of publication:

6. Year of copyright:

7. Series title and number:

8. Information from half title leaf or cover:

   a. Variant title:
   b. Variant or added subtitle:

9. Pages (last number actually printed in each section):

10. Number of volumes, if more than one:

11. Illustrative matter (check as appropriate):

	one	some	many	some colored	all colored	some folded	all folded
a. Portraits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		
b. Plates (i.e. on leaves not part of main text)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Maps							
d. Other illustrations (drawings, diagrams, tables, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		

12. Width after binding: 13. Height after binding:

14. Additional information for serials:

   a. Volume and number designation and/or date:
   b. Frequency:
   c. Connection with preceding publications:

15. Is there a preassigned LC card number: ☐ yes ☐ no It is_____

16. Proofs and cataloging copy will be returned to the sender unless you wish otherwise; in which case, check in box and give instructions on verso. See verso: ☐

Signature:_____

Publisher:_____

165-34 (rev. 12/58)

APPENDIX D
(Item 4.)

The Library of Congress has cataloged this publication as follows:

Sprigler, Augustine Joseph, 1878–
An ABC of the spiritual life. Milwaukee, Bruce Pub. Co. [1958]
136 p. 21 cm.

1. Spiritual life—Catholic authors. I. Title.
BX2350.S6 248 58-13780 ‡
Library of Congress

© 1958 The Bruce Publishing Company
MADE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APPENDIX D
(Item 5.)

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871-1945. The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958] 178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library) Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel. 1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author. QL673.H413 (598.2) 58-62521

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871-1945. The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958] 178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library) Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel. 1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author. QL673.H413 (598.2) 58-62521

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871-1945. The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958] 178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library) Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel. 1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author. QL673.H413 (598.2) 58-62521

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871-1945. The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958] 178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library) Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel. 1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author. QL673.H413 (598.2) 58-62521

APPENDIX D
(Item 6.)

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871–1945.
The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958]

178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library)

Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel.

1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author.

QL673.H413 598.2 58-62521

Library of Congress

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871–1945.
The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958]

178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library)

Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel.

1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author.

QL673.H413 598.2 58-62521

Library of Congress

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871–1945.
The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958]

178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library)

Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel.

1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author.

QL673.H413 598.2 58-62521

Library of Congress

Heinroth, Oskar, 1871–1945.
The birds, by Oskar Heinroth and Katharina Heinroth. [Translated by Michael Cullen] Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958]

178 p. illus. 20 cm. (Ann Arbor science library)

Translation of Aus dem Leben der Vögel.

1. Birds—Habits and behavior. I. Heinroth, Katharina, joint author.

QL673.H413 598.2 58-62521

Library of Congress

APPENDIX D
(Item 7a)

August 11, 1958

Library of Congress

Descriptive Cataloging Division

Procedures for Publishers Participating in the Cataloging-in-Source Project

Cataloging-in-Source. The Cataloging-in-Source project of the Library of Congress is a temporary experiment designed to explore and study during the next nine months, the mechanics, economics, and feasibility of cataloging books before printing in order to provide full cataloging information in the publications themselves. All publishers are invited to participate. We hope you will include catalog entries in all of your publications to be released within the next nine months, but it is understood that you may exclude from the program those titles in which you find it impossible or undesirable to include the catalog entry. For the purposes of this experiment the aim is to have the cataloging information presented in as many publications as possible.

Procedures.

1. Send final page proof (as complete as possible) to:

The Library of Congress
Descriptive Cataloging Division
Washington 25, D. C.

using the postage-free mailing labels that are provided for this purpose. These labels will provide for special delivery (and air mail, unless only a short distance to Washington is involved).

2. Enclose a copy of the "Cataloging Data Sheet" on which any information not actually in the proof itself should be filled in. There is a special data sheet on blue paper for use in connection with offset reprints.

3. Two copies of printer's proof of the cataloging entry will be mailed to you within one working day of receipt of the publication. Both cataloging entry and the proof copy of the publication will be returned to the original address unless other mailing instructions are given on the data sheet.

APPENDIX D
(Item 7b)

4. The position in the publication that is assigned to the cataloging copy is determined by the publisher. From the point of view of the libraries using this information the following is the order of preference:

a. Verso of the title page (copyright page);
b. At the end of the text, with reference on the verso of the title page reading to this effect:

> The Library of Congress catalog entry for this book [publication] appears at the end of the text;

c. For paper covered books, inside front cover, or either side of back cover, with reference on the verso of the title page;
d. Any other space available, with reference on verso of the title page.

5. The style in which the cataloging information is printed is likewise determined by the publisher providing (a) the text is given unchanged and in full and (b) the capitalization and punctuation are followed exactly. The following is the order of preference in this regard:

a. 1 to 1 reproduction of the card proof;
b. Reduced reproduction of the card proof;
c. Reset entry conforming at least in indentions, general format, and relative proportions to the original proof;
d. Reset entry condensed but complete.

6. The catalog entry in the publication should have a caption (preferably at least a half inch above it) to this effect:

> The Library of Congress has cataloged this book [publication] as follows:

7. It is preferable that the catalog entry not be framed by a border.

APPENDIX D
(Item 7c)

8. No note of preassigned Library of Congress catalog card number should be made for Cataloging-in-Source books. The cataloging copy will include this card number.

9. Please address all correspondence relating to operational phases of this program to:

Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division
Library of Congress
Washington 25, D. C.

APPENDIX E

CATALOGING-IN-SOURCE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FINAL REPORT

By

Bella E. Shachtman, Chief
Catalog and Records Section
U.S. Department of Agriculture Library

On June 5, 1958, L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, wrote to Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director of the Department Library, requesting the cooperation of the Department in the Cataloging-in-Source experiment being carried on by the Library of Congress on a national basis, under a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. It was requested that 100 Department titles be included in the experiment and that the original cataloging of these titles be performed by the Department Library staff.

Department Library personnel met with John Cronin, Director, Processing Department, Library of Congress, and members of his staff, and with representatives of the major publishing agencies of the Department. On August 21, 1958, Mr. Mohrhardt wrote to Mr. Mumford on behalf of the Department indicating that the Department would cooperate in the Cataloging-in Source experiment.

Within the Department, the following agencies agreed to cooperate: Office of Information, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agricultural Research Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, Forest Service, and Soil Conservation Service. Liaison people in each agency were appointed, and they cooperated wholeheartedly with the Library for the duration of the experiment.

It was decided that publications issued in the field offices of the Department would not be included in the experiment, and that Cataloging-in-Source for titles

APPENDIX E

issued in Washington would be limited to research, technical and semi-technical publications whether printed or offset. All popular publications, such as Farmers Bulletins and Leaflets, were omitted since the cooperating Department agencies felt that in most cases these publications would not have the necessary space to accomodate the catalog information and also that Cataloging-in-Source would detract from the appeal of these publications. Issues of periodicals were also omitted.

On September 18, 1958, following advisory meetings with the cooperating agencies, the Department Library sent the following materials to each of these agencies preparatory to beginning the experiment:

1. Procedures for Department Agencies Participating in the Cataloging-in-Source Project. (Based on procedure sent to commercial publishers by the Library of Congress, adjusted to the needs of the Department)

2. Samples of the Library of Congress Cataloging Data Sheet for new publications.

3. Samples of the Library of Congress Cataloging Data Sheet for Offset Reprints.

4. Copies of legend printed and supplied by the Library of Congress:

The Library of Congress catalog entry appears at the end of this publication.

The Library of Congress catalog entry appears at the end of this publication.

5. Sample of catalog card entries in catalog card form in various reductions, supplied by the Library of Congress.

6. Sample of catalog card entries in paragraph form in various reductions, supplied by the Library of Congress.

APPENDIX E

7. Copy of the Agricultural Marketing Service instructions to their Group Leaders in the Marketing Information Division.

On October 1, 1958, the date agreed upon to begin the experiment in the Department, the first title to be handled was received from the Agricultural Marketing Service. Unfortunately, it could not be Cataloged-in-Source because it was a new issue of an old serial title and involved recataloging. The first two manuscripts to be accepted for the experiment were received and processing was begun on October 2. The 100th title was received on February 25, 1959. On that date, the Department agencies were notified that the experiment would end. During the course of the experiment, brief monthly reports on its progress were prepared for the information of the Department cooperating agencies and the Director of the Department Library. An average of 20 titles were handled each month. Statistics for the 100 publications by agency and type of publication show:

Agency	Type of Publication	
	Camera Copy	Final Proof
Agricultural Marketing Service.....	48	6
Agricultural Research Service.....	4	23
Federal Extension Service..... (Inadvertently included)	0	1
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	0	0
Forest Service.....	0	5
Library.....	1	0
Soil Conservation Service.....	0	12
Totals...	53	47

During the period of the experiment, a total of seven titles submitted to the Library for Cataloging-in-Source were rejected; six, because they were new issues of old serial titles and they would have required recataloging; one, because it was the 15th section of a new work-in-parts.

APPENDIX E

Publisher Reaction

At the end of the experiment, in accordance with the Library of Congress request for information on publisher reaction to Cataloging-in-Source, a memorandum was sent to each of the cooperating agencies asking specific questions. The reply received from each agency is attached. It must be borne in mind that all camera copy was handled directly between the issuing agency and the Department Library; that all final proof was handled directly between the Office of Information and the Department Library. In summary, these reports show:

1. Messenger arrangements between the Library and the agencies: Satisfactory.

2. Interruptions to editorial and production schedules: No serious interruptions. (Most tight-schedule titles were not submitted to the Library).

3. Design problems: Occasionally a page had to be retyped. Placement and size of the catalog card entry caused some concern.

4. Estimate of average extra cost per title: From less than $1.00 (camera copy) to $8.00 additional printing costs, plus $1.32 personal service (printer's proof).

5. Other Comments:

   Authors object to inclusion of birth dates.

   Many publications would not have space for the catalog card entry.

   Catalog entry would detract from appearance of the popular publications.

   Limit catalog information to the call numbers and other information not self-evident in the publications

APPENDIX E

Limit Cataloging-in-Source to publications printed mainly for record and reference.

Limit Cataloging-in-Source to non-rush and non-popular publications. ("Popular" defined as an edition of 10,000 or more; number to be decided).

Allow adequate time for cataloging to assure that catalog entry will not later prove embarrassing to the Library, the publisher or the author.

6. General attitude on continuing Cataloging-in-Source:

Glad to continue if useful.

Could continue on the limited basis used for the experiment.

Willing to continue but prefer that entries be much less conspicuous.

Continuing would require reorganization of procedures and additional staff.

Library Experience

In accordance with the agreement made to perform the original cataloging of the Department publications included in the Cataloging-in-Source experiment, the Library maintained a step-by-step record for each title handled. This was done to learn what the effect would be on the Department Library, and to supply information to the Library of Congress for consideration of whether cooperative cataloging between other libraries and the Library of Congress is feasible and efficient for Cataloging-in-Source.

Given below is an analysis of the average time spent per title on the various steps of the process:

APPENDIX E

1. Total time from receipt of telephone call by the Department Library to the return of the publication with catalog card entry proof to the Department agency:

    a. Clock hours: 22.09

        (1) Longest time: 51 hours, 23 minutes (Permission for delay granted by publishing agency).

        (2) Shortest time: 5 hours, 8 minutes.

    b. Working hours: 9.35

        (1) Department Library (work day 9:00 - 5:30): 3 hours (Includes messenger trips within the Department; excludes trips between libraries).

        (2) Library of Congress (work day 8:30 - 5:15): 6 hours (Excludes messenger trips between libraries).

2. Control: 22 minutes. (Includes training and conferences because of new staff: 11 minutes; receipt of printed cards: 1.5 minutes; receipt of published title: 1.5 minutes).

3. Cataloging:

    a. Searching and descriptive and subject cataloging: 45 minutes.

        (1) Includes training and conferences because of new staff.

        (2) Because all titles processed were monographs in previously cataloged series, no classification was involved.

    b. Revision: 38 minutes. (Includes training and conferences because of new staff).

APPENDIX E

4. Preparation:

    a. Typing manuscript for Library of Congress: 9 minutes (Includes corrections).

    b. Completing printed cards for public catalog: 10.5 minutes.

    c. Processing after receipt of the published title: 2 minutes.

5. Library messenger trips: 42 minutes. (Some trips coincided. If each title required a separate trip, 1 hour would have to be allowed).

As was to be expected, problems were encountered both prior to and following the publication of many of the titles. The data sheets supplied by the Library of Congress were not used by the Department agencies because ordinarily the complete manuscript was supplied to the Library. In some cases, editors attached informal notes showing type of cover to be used and finished size of publication. Problems prior to publication which necessitated telephone calls between the Department Library and the agencies numbered 48; of these, 18 were problems of collation, 6 were imprint problems, 7 concerned series numbering or title, 6 were problems concerning type and wording of covers, 2 concerned placement, size and form of the Cataloging-in-Source information, and the remainder were miscellaneous individual problems.

There were only 11 calls concerning problems between the Department Library and the Library of Congress; these pointed out no particular problem areas as such since there were no more than 2 calls on the same type of problem. At the beginning of the project, it was agreed between the two libraries that manuscript camera copy would not be sent to the Library of Congress in order to avoid any more handling than was absolutely necessary. It was agreed further that if this created problems of subject assignment to the Library of Congress, the matter would be reconsidered. It is a highlight of the project to report that in not a single case of the 53 camera copy manuscripts handled was even a telephone call necessary between the two libraries to solve a problem of subject assignment.

APPENDIX E

An examination of the proof of the catalog card supplied by the Library of Congress revealed that in 34 cases the descriptive cataloging information supplied by the Department Library was changed by the Library of Congress. Change in punctuation accounted for 8 of these cases, imprint changes for 8, author or joint author changes for 7, title, collation and note changes for 3 each, recataloging as a serial for 1, and recataloging as a dash-on for 1. As a result of this analysis, it is planned to discuss some of these changes with the Library of Congress to avoid as many differences as possible in the routine cooperative cataloging copy supplied by this Library.

Because of changes made by the Department agencies after the manuscripts were originally cataloged, in 5 cases the titles were resubmitted to the Department Library and were recataloged. New proof of the catalog card entry was prepared and supplied by the Library of Congress.

Following publication, 91 of the 100 titles included in the experiment were examined. This showed that 21 changes were made by the cooperating agencies after the cataloging was completed. All of these changes affected the descriptive cataloging as shown below:

Type of cover changed:	5
Paging changed:	9
Title omitted:	1
Date of publication changed:	2
Date of publication moved from title page:	1
Order of publisher information changed	1
Location of publisher information changed:	2

APPENDIX E

In these cases, the manuscripts had not been resubmitted to the Library for correction of cataloging information prior to publication of the title. Therefore the cataloging information published in the title was incorrect.

In so far as the Cataloging-in-Source information was concerned, in only one case did space limitation require the conversion of the information to reduced size in paragraph form. In 8 cases, the information was inside the publication and no reference to it was printed on the verso of the title page; in 5 cases the information was spaced too close to or in between other information; in 1 case the information did not reproduce clearly, and in 1 case the information was omitted. Unfortunately, it is not known in how many cases the information to be included in camera copy had to be retyped.

Although the Foreign Agricultural Service did not submit any manuscripts for the Cataloging-in-Source experiment, they were most cooperative in supplying to the Library a list of the publications they issued during the period of the experiment. They published 13 titles of which 8 were annual reports in old series. The other five titles were examined by the Library staff and one of these would have required additional paging to include the catalog card information. The Foreign Agricultural Service staff estimated that the four others would have required additional pages also. For these four, the Library staff found that in 1 case there was space inside the back cover; in 1, there was space inside the front cover and on the last page; in the last 2, retyping of the catalog card information would have been necessary in order to include the information in the publication.

Conclusion

From the Department agencies' viewpoint, it would seem that if Cataloging-in-Source is proved useful and were to become a permanent program of the Library of Congress, the Department could consider cooperating on a limited basis. However, an educational program would be necessary for the personnel of the various publication offices of the Department to assure that all manuscripts subject to Cataloging-in-Source are sent to the Library, and that any changes made in the manuscript following cataloging are called to the attention of the Library prior to publication of the title.

APPENDIX E

From the Department Library viewpoint, Cataloging-in-Source is evidently no more costly per title than supplying cooperative catalog copy for the important publications of the Department to the Library of Congress. However, because of the necessity for top speed in handling the manuscripts, the present small staff of the Library would be unable to cope with Cataloging-in-Source on a permanent basis. It is to the present staff's credit that the experiment was carried through so well, but tension was high and interruptions to other work were costly. An informal poll of the catalogers' opinions shows that as a group they found participation in the experiment stimulating; that they liked most learning that Cataloging-in-Source is practical from the production viewpoint; that they disliked most the heavy work pressure inherent in the project, and were dissatisfied with the unavoidable inaccuracies in cataloging due to changes made by the publishing agencies; and finally, that if Cataloging-in-Source were to become a permanent program, additional cataloging staff would be imperative.

If Cataloging-in-Source were to become a permanent program, on the basis of the experiment it is estimated that a special messenger and additional professional cataloging personnel would be required on the Library staff. During the experiment, in order to provide prompt messenger service between the Library and the cooperating Department agencies and between the Library and the Library of Congress, one additional messenger was hired for the staff. All material returned from the Library of Congress to the Department Library was brought by a Library of Congress messenger. No additional cataloging staff was employed during this period.

Areas for further consideration if Cataloging-in-Source should become a national program include:

1. Cataloging of Department publications issued outside of Washington, D. C.

2. Omission of authors' dates of birth.

3. Omission of collation information. About half the problems both prior to and following publication concerned collation.

APPENDIX E

4. What other information, if any, can be omitted from the catalog card?

5. Can notes concerning "Supersedes," and "Continues" etc. be omitted from the publications but be supplied to the library doing the cataloging, to avoid showing the same information twice in the published title?

6. Does the Library of Congress benefit in any degree by having a cooperating library supply catalog card copy?

7. If benefit is derived from the cooperating library's work, can the Library of Congress accept the catalog card copy in all cases without the manuscript of the publication?

This Department will be most interested to learn the results of the Cataloging-in-Source experiment and of the Consumer Reaction Survey to the experiment. We are looking forward to the receipt of copies of the final published report which will cover the national scene.

In closing this report, our thanks go to the agencies of the Department for their complete cooperation in a nationwide experiment, to the staff of the Library of Congress for its wholehearted interest and cooperation throughout the Department's participation in the experiment, and finally to the members of the Department Library staff who were involved for their intense interest in and efforts made on behalf of the national Cataloging-in-Source experiment.

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-a)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
1. Abingdon Press	6	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	0	3
2. Academic Press	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
3. Addison-Wesley	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4
4. Aero Publishers	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
5. Allen, Howard	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	3
6. American Library Assoc.	2	0	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	2	0	0
7. American Technical Society	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	2
8. Association Press	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
9. Augsburg Publishers	9	0	9	0	0	0	8	1	9	9	0	6
10. Barnes & Noble	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	4	4	0	2
11. Bethany Press	14	0	14	0	0	0	11	3	14	14	0	6
12. Bobbs-Merrill	4	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	0	1
13. Broadman Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
14. Brookings Institution	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
15. Bruce Publishing Co.	12	0	12	0	0	0	5	1	6	12	0	4
16. California Div. of Mines	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	1
17. Catholic Univ. of America	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2
18. Chambers, E. L.	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	1
19. Chilton Company	6	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	6	5	1	0
20. Columbia Univ. Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3
21. Compton, F. E.	1	1	2	1	0	0	4	0	4	2	0	0

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-b)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
22. Concordia Publishing House	12	0	12	0	0	0	5	2	7	11	1	7
23. Cornell University Press	8	0	8	1	0	0	8	0	8	5	3	1
24. Coward-McCann	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
25. Crowell, Thomas	19	0	19	0	1	0	15	3	18	15 (1)	2	4
26. Crown Publishers	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
27. Davis, F. A.	5	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	5	0	1
28. Day, John	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	1	2	1
29. Dennison, T. S.	13	0	13	0	0	0	8	0	8	13	0	10
30. Dial Press	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	1
31. Duell, Sloan, Pearce	14	0	14	0	0	0	3	0	3	14	0	4
32. Duke University Press	10	0	10	2	0	0	4	0	4	10	0	5
33. Dutton, E. P.	10	0	10	0	0	0	8	3	11	9	1	6
34. Feldheim, Phillip	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	1
35. Follett Publishing Co.	2	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	2	0	1
36. Forest Press	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
37. Funk, Wilfred	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2
38. Funk & Wagnalls	10	0	10	1	0	0	3	1	4	7	3	2
39. Grolier Society	6	2	8	1	1	0	7	5	12	8	0	4
40. Grove Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	1	5	0	2	2
41. Grune & Stratton	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	3	0	1
42. Gun Digest	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	0

(1) 2 titles not available for examination

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-c)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
43. Harper & Brothers	91	0	91	0	0	0	20	8	28	81	10	39
44. Harvard Club of Virginia	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
45. Harvard University Press	5	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	1
46. Hastings House	6	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	5
47. Hawthorn Books	25	0	25	4	0	1	25	5	30	24	1	18
48. Heath, D. C.	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	1
49. Herder, B.	5	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	4	5	0	3
50. Hill & Wang	5	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	4	1	4
51. Hoeber, Paul B.	4	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3
52. Houghton, Mifflin	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	1
53. Indiana University Press	7	0	7	0	0	1	6	0	6	7	0	2
54. Irwin, Richard D.	4	0	4	0	0	0	5	0	5	4	0	2
55. Johns Hopkins Press	12	0	12	0	0	1	14	1	15	12	0	5
56. Kenedy, P.J.	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0
57. Knox, John	8	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	4	7	1	3
58. Lea & Febiger	3	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	5	3	0	3
59. Lippincott, J.B.	14	0	14	0	0	0	7	0	7	10	4	4
60. Little, Brown & Co.	4	0	4	0	0	0	8	0	8	3	1	2
61. Louisiana (State)	1	3	4	0	3	0	5	1	6	4	0	1
62. Louisiana State Univ.Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1
63. Loyola University Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	3	0	1

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-d)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
64. McDowell, Oblensky, Inc.	3	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	0	2
65. McKay, David	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	3
66. Messner, Julian	7	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3
67. Michigan (State)	2	1	3	0	0	1	4	1	5	3	0	2
68. Military Service Pub. Co.	3	1	4	1	0	0	3	0	3	4	0	1
69. Moore, John W.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
70. Muhlenberg, Press	5	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	6	5	0	2
71. National Academy of Sciences National Research Council	12	4	16	0	4	1	3	4	7	15	1	7
72. National Educ. Assoc of US	12	5	17	3	3	2	5	2	7	17	0	11
73. NEA - American Academy Physical Education	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
74. NEA - American Assoc. for Health, Physical Educ. & Rec	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	0	0
75. NEA - Amer. Assoc. of School Administrators	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
76. NEA - American Educ. Research Association	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
77. NEA - Association for Higher Education	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
78. NEA - Assoc. for Supervisors & Curriculum Dev.	2	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	0
79. NEA - Educational Policies Commission	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
80. NEA - National Assoc. of Secondary School Prin.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1
81. NEA - National Science Teachers Assoc.	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
82. Nelson, Thomas & Sons	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	1
83. Newman Press	6	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	0	5
84. Norton, W. W.	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-e)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
85. Paleontological Research Institution	2	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	4	2	0	2
86. Pitman Publishing Co.	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	2
87. Post Motor Books	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
88. Princeton U. Press	25	0	25	0	0	1	25	4	29	22 (2)	2	17
89. Putnam, G. P. Sons	12	0	12	0	0	0	9	0	9	10	2	5
90. Rand, McNally & Co.	5	0	5	0	0	0	6	0	6	5	0	3
91. Regnery, Henry Co.	12	0	12	0	0	0	6	2	8	12	0	5
92. Reinhold Pub. Co.	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	4	4	0	3
93. Reports Inc.	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0 (3)	0	0
94. Review & Herald Pub. Assn.	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
95. Rider, John F.	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	3	2
96. Ronald Press	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	1	5	3	1	1
97. Row, Peterson & Co.	4	0	4	0	0	0	7	0	7	4	0	1
98. Russell & Russell	16	0	16	0	0	0	7	10	17	14 (4)	1	11
99. Russell Sage Foundation	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
100. Rutgers U. Press	6	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	9	6	0	5
101. Saunders, W. B. Co.	22	7	29	1	6	1	28	3	31	19	10	16
102. Scarecrow Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1
103. Scribners, Charles Sons	6	0	6	0	0	0	3	3	6	0	6	3
104. Sheed & Ward	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	3	0	2
105. Shoe String Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1

(2) 1 title not available for examination
(3) 1 title not available for examination
(4) 1 title not available for examination

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-f)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
106. Simon & Schuster	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	3	0	0
107. Southern Methodist University Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
108. Southern Regional Educational Board	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	1	0	0
109. Speller, Robert & Sons	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
110. Stackpole Co.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
111. Stanford U. Press	14	2	16	1	2	2	16	1	17	15	1	7
112. Sterling Publishing Co.	3	0	3	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	3	2
113. Syracuse U. Press	3	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	2
114. United Synagogue Commission	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
115. Univ. of Chicago Press	24	0	24	0	0	0	16	2	18	23	1	9
116. Univ. of Dayton Marian Library	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
117. Univ. of Illinois Press	16	1	17	0	1	1	9	0	9	16	1	9
118. Univ. of Kentucky Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	2
119. Univ. of Maryland Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	0	2
120. Univ. of Michigan Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	2	1	3
121. Univ. of Minnesota Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
122. Univ. of North Carolina Press	11	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	0	7
123. Univ. of Notre Dame Press	6	0	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	0	3
124. Univ. of Oklahoma Press	2	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0
125. Univ. of Texas Press	3	0	3	0	0	0	4	1	5	3	0	3
126. Univ. of Virginia Press	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-g)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in CIS entries in books and on cards
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
127. Univ. of Wisconsin Press	4	0	4	0	0	1	5	0	5	3	1	3
128. Van Nostrand, D. Co.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
129. Viking Press (Includes Studio Pub.)	4	0	4	0	0	0	4	3	7	3	1	3
130. Walck, Henry Z. Inc.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
131. Walker, A. M.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
132. Washburn, Ives Inc.	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	2
133. Watts, Franklin Inc.	12	0	12	0	0	0	4	7	11	10	2	11
134. Wenner-Gren Foundation	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
135. Westminster Press	7	0	7	0	0	0	5	1	6	7	0	4
136. Whittet & Shepperson	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
137. Wilson, H. W. Co.	8	12	20	5	9	1	18	0	18	19	1	4
138. Winston, John C. Co.	8	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	3	8	0	3
139. World Publishing Co.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
140. Yale Univ. Press	4	0	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	2	3
141. Yoseloff, Thomas Inc.	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Subtotal (1 - 141)	796	49	845	26	36	16	528	107	635	746	94	416
142. U. S. Dept. of Agriculture	99	1	100	0	3	2	0	0	0	95 (5)	1	53
143. U. S. Dept. of Commerce a. Bureau of Foreign Com.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
144. b. Nat. Bureau of Standards	6	1	7	0	2	1	3	1	4	7	0	5
145. c. Office of Business Economics	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1

(5) 4 titles not available for examination

APPENDIX F
(Table 1-h)

Statistics of Overall Cataloging Performance and Results by Publisher

PUBLISHER	Titles sent for CIS			Analysis of earlier printed cards used & add'l. entries made			Communication necessary in connection with catalog entries prepared			CIS entry published in book	CIS entry not published in book	Errors in publisher and card entry
	Monographs	Serials	Total	Without Revision	With Revision	Additional required entries made	Letters	Tele. Calls	Total			
146. U. S. Dept. of Health, Edu. & Welfare a. Library	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
147. b. Office of Education	11	1	12	2	0	1	1	0	1	9	3	10
148. c. Public Health Service	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	6
149. d. Social Security Adm.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
150. U. S. Dept. of Labor a. Bureau of Labor Stand.	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
151. b. Bureau of Labor Stat.	11	2	13	2	2	2	0	2	2	12 (6)	0	8
152. c. Womens Bureau	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	2
153. U.S. Dept. of Interior a. Bureau of Mines	50	0	50	0	1	2	4	5	9	50	0	20
154. b. Fish & Wildlife Service	22	1	23	0	1	3	1	0	1	22	0	5
155. c. Geological Survey	86	0	86	2	0	2	3	1	4	76 (7)	4	69
156. U. S. Govt. Printing Office	2	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
157. U.S. Library of Congress	26	20	46	7	14	1	0	2	2	44	2	15
Subtotal (142 - 157)	330	28	358	15	26	17	13	13	26	336	11	199
GRAND TOTAL (1 - 157)	1126	77	1203	41	62	33	541	120	661	1082	105	615

(6) 1 title not available for examination
(7) 6 titles not available for examination

APPENDIX F
(Table 2)

Characteristics of the Publications
Cataloged under the Cataloging in Source Project

	Number of publs.	% of publs.	Number of entries	% of entries
Total number	1,203	100	1,236	100
Monographs	1,126	94	1,132	92
Serials	77	6	104	8
New entry made	1,100	92	1,124	91
Existing printed card revised ...	62	5	66	5
Existing printed card used	41	3	46	4
U. S. official publications	358	30	375	30
Other publications	845	70	861	70
Cataloged entirely at LC	968	80	991	80
Cataloged by cooperating library.	235	20	245	20

APPENDIX F
(Table 3)

Time Required at Library of Congress for Cataloging in Source

Table A: Record in Meeting Time Objective

	Totals	U.S. official publs.	Other publs.	Original cataloging	Cooperative cataloging
Number of entries	1,236	375	861	991	245
*Completed within 24 hours	1,060	330	730	835	225
Percent	86%	88%	85%	84%	92%
*Completed within 26 hours	1,154	356	798	919	235
Percent	93%	95%	92%	93%	96%
*Completed within 48 hours	1,224	372	852	981	243
Percent	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%

Table B: Average Elapsed Time Per Entry** (in hours and minutes)

	All publs.	U.S. official publs.	Other publs.
All cataloging	7:10	6:45	7:20
Original cataloging.....	7:24	7:43	7:20
Cooperative cataloging	6:16	6:11	7:14
U.S. Dept. Agriculture.....	5:36	5:36	----
Other libraries	6:46	6:42	7:14

*Exclusive of: 1) Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays
2) Time spent on CIS titles by cooperating libraries

**Exclusive of: 1) Hours outside of scheduled working hours
2) Time spent on CIS titles by cooperating libraries

APPENDIX F
(Table 4)

Average Working Time per Entry
Spent at the Library of Congress
on Various Cataloging-In-Source Operations

	Average minutes per operation				
	Overall average	U.S. official publs	Other publs.	Original cataloging	Cooperative cataloging
Cataloging Operations					
Typist	7	7	6	7	7
Descriptive cataloger	38	33	40	41	26
Coordinator of Cooperative Cat.	*	*	*	-	7
Typist	*	*	*	-	2
Subject cataloger	14	9	16	16	6
Shelflister	8	14	6	7	14
Decimal classifier	5	4	5	5	4
Editor of Subject Headings	2	2	1	1	2
Card and Printing Operations					
Card Division	17	20	15	16	19
Printing	146	164	138	142	160

APPENDIX F
(Table 5-a)

Analysis of Errors and Types of Changes Required

	Number	Percent
1. Errors in publisher and card entry.....	615	100
2. Average number of changes per entry....	1.7	-
3. Analysis of changes in entries by type		
A. Heading changes.....	28	2.6
B. Transcription changes		
1. Title changed.....	12	1.
2. Subtitle added.....	13	1.2
3. Editor added.....	2	.1
4. Other additions.....	30	2.8
5. Other changes.....	43	4.
6. Total.....	100	9.4
C. Imprint changes		
1. Brackets deleted.....	23	2.1
2. Publisher added.....	40	3.7
3. Date changed from 1958 to 1959.	69	6.4
4. Other changes in date or copyright.....	34	3.
5. Other imprint changes.....	18	1.6
6. Total.....	184	17.3
D. Collation changes (Pagination)		
1. Increased.....	94	8.8
2. Decreased.....	121	11.3
3. Other.....	27	2.5
4. Total.....	242	22.8
E. Collation changes (Illustration Statement)		
1. Addition.....	28	2.6
2. Other.....	43	4.
3. Total.....	71	6.7
F. Collation changes (Size).....	192	18.
G. Collation changes (Total D-F).....	505	47.5
H. Series note changes		
1. Deleted.....	6	.5
2. Added.....	11	1.
3. Series number added.....	6	.5
4. Other.....	27	2.5
5. Total.....	50	4.7

APPENDIX F
(Table 5-b)

Analysis of Errors and Types of Changes Required (Cont.)

		Number	Percent
I.	Notes		
	1. Added	46	4.3
	2. Changed	56	5.2
	3. Total	102	9.6
J.	Classification		
	1. Changes	10	45.5
	2. Additions	1	4.5
	3. Shelflisting	11	50.
	4. Total	22	2.1
K.	Subject Headings		
	1. Changes	13	50.
	2. Additions	5	19.3
	3. Deletions	3	11.5
	4. Spelling Errors	2	7.7
	5. Order of headings	1	3.8
	6. Headings put in brackets	2	7.7
	7. Total	26	2.4
L.	LC card number changes	6	.6
M.	Miscellaneous changes	39	3.7
N.	Total all changes (A - M)	1,062	-

APPENDIX F
(Table 6)

Analysis of Position of Entries in Books and Characteristics of Design of Reproduced Entries

	Total	Percent
1. Entries in front of book		
A. Verso of title page	697	64.2
B. P.2 of cover	63	5.8
C. Fly-leaf either side	-	-
D. Other	29	2.6
E. Total	789	72.7
2. Entries in back of book		
A. Colophon	238	21.9
B. Fly-leaf either side	18	1.6
C. P.3 of cover	35	3.2
D. P.4 of cover	5	.4
E. Total	296	27.2
3. Total (1 - 2)	1,085	-

	Total	Percent
1. Entries reset		
A. Same as to form	332	30.5
B. Variations in form	237	21.8
C. Closed up	168	15.4
D. Total	737	67.9
2. Entries photoreproduced		
A. Same (ratio one to one)	309	28.4
B. Reduced	39	3.5
C. Total	348	32.
3. Total (1 - 2)	1,085	-

APPENDIX G
(Item 1.)

Sample Formats of CIS Entries

PREFACE

Law
Coll. Sets.
"Aero"

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLICATION IS TWOFOLD

To combine in one volume all of the CIVIL AIR REGULATIONS that are required and recommended by the CAA for Aircraft and Powerplant Mechanics.

&

To furnish a REFERENCE of typical questions and answers on CAR's that are similar to those asked by the CAA for A & P Mechanics certificates; and including the Government's own interpretations of their requirements for Mechanics and Repairman Certificates.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number:
58-13943

Aero Publishers, inc.
Civil air regulations and reference for mechanics.

Los Angeles.

v. illus. 27 cm. biennial.

Title varies: 19 –56, Civil air regulations for A-and-E mechanics (varies slightly)
Prepared 19 by the Associated Aeronautical Staff of Aero Publishers.

1. Aeronautics—U. S.—Laws and regulations. 2. Airworthiness certificates—U. S. 3. Aviation mechanics (Persons) I. Title.

58–13943 ‡
*629.142 629.13076

Library of Congress

APPENDIX G
(Item 2.)

Hutchison, William R

The transcendentalist ministers; church reform in the New England Renaissance. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1959.

240 p. illus. 22 cm. (Yale historical publications. Miscellany 71)

"This study in an earlier form was submitted in candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy in Yale University."

1. Transcendentalism (New England) 2. Unitarians in New England. I. Title.

B905.H8 141.30974 59-6797 ‡

Library of Congress

APPENDIX G
(Item 3.)

16 April 1959

The Library of Congress Catalog Card

HAUSER, PHILIP MORRIS, 1909– *ed.*

The study of population: an inventory and appraisal, edited by Philip M. Hauser and Otis Dudley Duncan. [Chicago] University of Chicago Press [1959]

864 p. illus. 25 cm.

1. Demography. 2. Population. I. Duncan, Otis Dudley, joint ed.

HB871.H37 312 58–11949‡

Library of Congress

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO 37
Cambridge University Press, London, N.W. 1, England
The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5, Canada

© *1959 by The University of Chicago. Published 1959*
Composed and printed by THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, *Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*

APPENDIX G
(Item 4.)

INDEX

Wars of the Congregation (1559-1560), 15, 16, 26-27, 88, 269
Wemyss of Myrecarnie, Andrew, 154
witchcraft, trials, 1590-1591, 229-31; Bothwell accused of, 229-30, 244, 262-63
Worcester, Edward Somerset, 4th earl of, 228
Wotton, Edward, English ambassador to Scotland, 65, 66, 85n, 89, 271; embassy of, 67ff; and death of Lord Russell, 72-74

Young, George, secretary of privy council, 108n
Young, Peter, 198, 237n; mission to Denmark, 193-94

Zouche, Lord, English ambassador to Scotland, 270-72, 274

LEE, MAURICE. John Maitland of Thirlestane and the foundation of the Stewart despotism in Scotland. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1959. 314 p. illus. 24 cm. (Princeton studies in history, 11) 1. Maitland, John, baron of Thirlestane, 1543-1595. 2. Scotland—Hist.—To 1603. *Full name:* Maurice DuPont Lee. DA788.L4. (941.05.) 59-9097 ‡ Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress has cataloged this book as follows:

Willgoose, Carl E. Health education in the elementary school. Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Co., 1959. 450 pp. illus. 23 cm. 1. Health education. I. Title. RA440.5.W5 (371.76) 59-5081

RA440
.5
.W5

© 1959 BY W. B. SAUNDERS COMPANY

Copyright Under the International Copyright Union

All rights reserved. This book is protected by copyright. No part of it may be duplicated or reproduced in any manner without written permission from the publisher. Made in the United States of America at the press of W. B. Saunders Company.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 59-5081

APPENDIX G
(Item 6.)

THE BIBLE SPEAKS TO DAILY NEEDS

Copyright © MCMLIX by Abingdon Press

All rights in this book are reserved.
No part of the book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publishers except brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews. For information address Abingdon Press, Nashville 2, Tennessee.

The Library of Congress has
cataloged this book as follows:

Harkness, Georgia Elma. The Bible speaks to daily needs. New York, Abingdon Press [1959]. 94 p. 18 cm. 1. Devotional exercises. I. Title.
BV4832.2.H3 242.2 59-8196 ‡

Scripture quotations unless otherwise noted are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible and are copyright 1946 and 1952 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

SET UP, PRINTED, AND BOUND BY THE
PARTHENON PRESS, AT NASHVILLE,
TENNESSEE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APPENDIX H

COOPERATING LIBRARIES AND FIRMS

I. Libraries Interviewed with Questionnaire

Explanation of information:

(1) Number of volumes. Libraries were asked to give the "total number of volumes at beginning of current year (1959 or fiscal 1958/59)." Some of the figures include all in an institution, others exclude certain departmental libraries, certain materials such as government documents, etc.

(2) Number volumes added. The question was for "Number of volumes (including all copies, also bound volumes or serials) added to cataloged collection last year."

(3) New titles. Request was for "number of new titles (including new editions) cataloged last year."

(4) Percent current American. Question: "Approximate percentage of these (i.e., new titles added) which were current (1957-1958) American imprints."

(5) Interviewer. The library visits were made by: Eleanor E. Campion, Director, Philadelphia Bibliographic Center and Union Library Catalogue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Virginia Drewry, Library Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia; Richard O. Pautzsch, Coordinator of Cataloging, Brooklyn Public Library, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Esther J. Piercy, Chief of Processing, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Md.; and Joseph H. Treyz, Assistant Head, Catalogue Department, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn.

University, College, Research Libraries

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
Agnes Scott College, ... Decatur, Georgia	67,992	2,894	2,399	60	Drewry
Brown Univ., Providence, R.I.	992,263	44,647	30,316	25	Treyz
Univ. of Cal. at Berkeley..	2,305,121	78,762	38,521	20	Piercy

APPENDIX H

University, College, Research Libraries (Cont.)

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
Univ. of California at Los. Angeles.....	1,128,775	70,528	35,667	30	Piercy
Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.....	1,988,700	49,829	22,599	25-30	Pautzsch
Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio....	700,632	16,247	10,159	45	Drewry
Clark Univ. Worcester, Mass.....	ca220,000	2,397	ca2,000	80	Treyz
Colby College, Waterville, Maine.....	213,334	5,740	2,397	70	Treyz
Univ. of Colorado, Boulder.....	484,988	20,011	7,084	80	Piercy
Columbia Univ. New York, N. Y.....	2,356,292	71,616	38,834	11-25	Pautzsch
Cornell Univ. Ithaca, N. Y.....	1,408,202	58,749	32,269	40	Treyz
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.....	782,917	16,670	8,590	66	Treyz
Univ. of Delaware, Newark.....	ca250,000	9,619	10,227	30	Campion
Duke University, Durham, N.C.....	1,343,768	47,846	22,748	10-20	Treyz
Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.....	298,619	11,491	6,583	25	Drewry
Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.....	46,000	4,123	2,000	80	Drewry
Univ. of Florida, Gainesville.....	788,731	39,335	16,795	50	Drewry
Florida State Univ. Tallahassee.....	477,030	17,516	10,326	?	Drewry
Gonzaga Univ. Spokane, Wash.....	76,924	5,582	4,000	20	Piercy
Harvard College Lib. Cambridge, Mass.....	2,578,220	46,158	32,281	10-15	Treyz
University of Idaho Moscow.....	167,688	8,570	3,736	75	Piercy

APPENDIX H

University, College, Research Libraries (Cont.)

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
University of Illinois, Urbana	2,908,036	66,494	33,188	?	Pautzsch
Indiana University, Bloomington	900,000	38,000	20,771	40	Campion
Iowa State College, Ames	483,261	12,912	4,885	50	Pautzsch
State Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City	838,124	28,905	14,094	?	Pautzsch
Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.	885,176	14,192	7,557	35	Piercy
Joint Univ. Libraries, Nashville, Tenn.	402,164	17,551	12,052	?	Drewry
Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence	726,138	31,949	17,807	10	Piercy
Univ. of Kentucky, Lexington	828,000	17,611	9,318	65	Drewry
Louisiana State Univ. Baton Rouge	600,622	32,611	no rec	60	Drewry
Mass. Inst. of Tech. Cambridge	633,531	13,912	11,360	35	Treyz
Mass. State Teachers College, Fitchburg	35,000	ca600	ca600	60	Treyz
Univ. of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla	462,015	29,502	10,772	75	Drewry
Michigan State Univ., East Lansing	447,923	32,925	12,308	50	Campion
Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor	2,267,493	100,525	50,516	10-15	Campion
Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis	1,905,678	52,798	17,209	5-20	Pautzsch
Univ. of Missouri, Columbus	811,922	32,553	12,683	65	Piercy
Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln	621,170	26,771	10,173	30	Piercy
Univ. of N. Hampshire, Durham	258,025	12,688	4,316	60	Treyz

APPENDIX H

University, College, Research Libraries (Cont.)

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
University of New Mexico Albuquerque.....	283,710	11,649	6,302	?	Piercy
New York Public Library (Ref. Dept.).....	3,800,570	83,227	68,116	20	Pautzsch
New York University, New York City.....	1,063,990	17,218	12,761	75	Pautzsch
Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	898,417	40,127	41,889?	26	Treyz
Univ. of N.C. Woman's College, Greensboro...	178,742	7,968	3,624	90	Treyz
Northwestern Univ., Evanston.....	856,000	28,091	15,900	?	Pautzsch
Univ. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.....	427,003	23,872	12,404	60	Campion
Ohio State Univ., Columbus.....	1,252,819	57,856	18,642	35-40	Campion
Univ. of Oklahoma, Norman.....	577,423	32,311	9,942	35	Piercy
Oklahoma State Univ., Stillwater.....	403,316	22,329	9,025	60	Piercy
Univ. of Oregon, Eugene.....	655,007	33,110	14,780	35	Piercy
College of the Pacific, Stockton, Cal.....	72,812	5,500	3,736	80	Piercy
Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.....	1,570,009	41,587	8,000	45	Campion
Pennsylvania State Univ. Univ. Park.....	484,748	29,000	14,044	35	Campion
Phillips-Exeter Academy, Exeter, N.H.....	ca50,000	2,454	1,500	90	Treyz
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.....	1,406,940	35,570	20,211	40	Pautzsch
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind...	440,074	25,348	7,548	70	Campion
Reed College, Portland, Oregon.....	112,421	4,426	n.r.	60-70	Piercy

APPENDIX H

University, College, Research Libraries (Cont.)

	1. Vols.	2.Vols. added	3.New titles	4.% Am.	Interviewer
University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.	556,891	15,827	8,704	66	Treyz
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.	817,995	32,612	21,829	50	Pautzsch
Univ. of Southern Cal. Los Angeles	831,095	31,678	14,328	50	Piercy
Stanford University, Stanford, Cal.	1,355,715	51,234	14,802	65	Piercy
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.	193,291	6,226	3,889	50	Campion
Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.	438,945	21,479	8,249	45	Treyz
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	502,985	23,796	9,093	10	Drewry
University of Texas, Austin	1,248,265	39,946	18,129	35	Piercy
Tulane University, New Orleans, La.	429,024	11,027	7,960	85	Drewry
Univ. of Virginia, Charlottesville	895,632	34,573	24,029	35	Treyz
University of Washington, Seattle	971,935	33,289	15,537	20	Piercy
Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio	729,887	23,105	8,093	65	Campion
Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois	106,649	2,045	n.r.	60-75	Pautzsch
Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.	235,727	5,149	2,833	70	Treyz
Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison	1,052,923	44,858	31,500	?	Pautzsch
Univ. of Wyoming, Laramie	251,585	11,860	ca7,000	70	Piercy
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri	509,927	17,816	14,467	35	Piercy
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.	4,215,909	76,173	n.r.	10	Treyz

APPENDIX H

Public Libraries, Including State and Regional

	1.Vols. in Lib.	2.Vols. added	3.New titles	4.% Am.	Interviewer
Albuquerque P. L., Albuquerque, N. M....	145,142	20,656	6,981	95	Piercy
Ann Arbor P. L., Ann Arbor, Mich.....	100,423	5,555	3,355	98	Campion
Atlanta P. L., Atlanta, Ga.....	527,925	53,729	6,774	90	Drewry
Enoch Pratt Free L. Baltimore, Md.....	1,505,600	122,841	9,880	70	Piercy
Boston P.L.,(Home read'g) Boston, Mass.....	740,338	73,999	3,307	95	Treyz
Boston P. L. (Ref. Div.) Boston, Mass.....	1,405,511	17,500	11,377	?	Treyz
Brooklyn P. L., Brooklyn, N. Y.....	2,199,849	286,255	13,777	70	Pautzsch
California State L., Sacramento.....	509,221	7,118	5,470	65	Piercy
P.L. of Charlotte & Co., Charlotte, N. C.....	248,193	30,176	n.r.	75	Treyz
Chicago P. L., Chicago, Ill.....	2,289,148	86,110	5,642	95	Pautzsch
P.L. of Cincinnati & Co Cincinnati.....	1,865,515	84,812	12,298	80	Drewry
Cleveland P. L., Cleveland, Ohio.....	2,893,878	118,346	16,402	80	Campion
Cleveland.. Multi-Co. L. Norman, Okla.....	30,160	3,842	2,699	75	Piercy
Columbia P. L., Columbia, Mo.....	40,788	4,418	n.r.	over 50	Piercy
Columbus P.L., Columbus, Ohio.....	466,042	47,118	6,000	75	Campion
Dallas P. L., Dallas, Texas.....	395,000	53,607	11,338+	34	Piercy
Dearborn P. L., Dearborn, Mich.....	113,255	12,873	n.r.	90+	Campion
Denver P. L., Denver, Colorado.....	669,063	40,875	7,854	70	Piercy
Detroit P. L., Detroit, Michigan....	1,797,392	137,667	19,107	50	Campion

APPENDIX H

Public Libraries, Including State and Regional (Cont.)

	1.Vols in Lib.	2.Vols. added	3.New titles	4.% Am.	Interviewer
Evansville, P. L., Evansville, Ind.....	291,502	16,901	3,591	90	Drewry
Willard Library Evansville, Ind.....	59,678	3,818	ca3,000	75	Drewry
Evanston P. L., Evanston, Ill.....	155,859	9,052	n.r.	90	Pautzsch
Fitchburg P. L., Fitchburg, Mass.....	91,567	4,196	2,264	96+	Treyz
Flint P. L., Flint, Mich.....	292,519	23,443	4,884	90	Campion
Ga. State Dept. of Ed. (Card service).....	-	-	4,895	80	Drewry
Gary P. L., Gary, Indiana.....	321,823	38,571	5,503	90	Campion
Great Falls P. L., Great Falls, Mont...	88,112	5,653	ca4,500	90	Piercy
Hillsboro P. L., Hillsboro, Oregon...	ca14,450	650	n.r.	90	Piercy
Indianapolis P. L., Indianapolis, Ind...	722,656	51,849	5,664	90	Campion
Iowa City P. L., Iowa City, Iowa.....	67,000	3,500	1,750	80	Pautzsch
Kansas City P. L., Kansas City, Mo.....	816,000	64,357	7,137	75	Piercy
King Co. P. L., Seattle, Wash.....	281,832	17,632	4,512	85	Piercy
Lawson McGhee L., Knoxville, Tenn.....	151,405	6,917	1,994	98	Drewry
Los Angeles Co. P. L., Los Angeles, Cal....	1,241,107	152,890	5,557	78	Piercy
Los Angeles P. L., Los Angeles, Cal....	2,435,118	222,443	13,716	70	Piercy
Louisville Free P. L., Louisville, Ky.....	636,712	29,960	13,562	75	Drewry
Madison P. L., Madison, Wisconsin..	100,238	13,936	4,119	80	Pautzsch
Memphis P. L., Memphis, Tenn.....	472,769	61,073	n.r.	90	Drewry

APPENDIX H

Public Libraries, Including State and Regional (Cont.)

	1. Vols. in Lib.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
Miami P. L., Miami, Florida.....	283,653	42,702	ca6,000	90	Drewry
Milwaukee P. L., Milwaukee, Wisc....	1,395,850	95,454	14,873	75	Pautzsch
Minneapolis P. L., Minneapolis, Minn..	969,500	66,810	7,785	90	Pautzsch
Montclair P. L., Montclair, N.J.....	138,435	10,397	ca5,150	88	Pautzsch
Montgomery P. L., Montgomery, Ala....	73,957	3,480	2,965	99	Drewry
Nashville, P. L., Nashville, Tenn....	161,320	8,462	n.r.	80	Drewry
New Orleans P. L., New Orleans, La....	504,594	32,565	5,000	35	Drewry
New York P. L., (Circ. Dept.).....	2,696,125	389,959	19,284	50	Pautzsch
Newark P. L., Newark, N. J.....	797,519	53,373	8,283	66	Pautzsch
Regional P. L., Olympia, Wash.....	ca65,000	6,042	3,055	75	Piercy
Penn State L., Harrisburg, Pa.....	ca500,000	13,801	n.r.	87	Campion
Free L. of Philadelphia.....	1,759,665	212,293	15,814	75	Campion
Carnegie L. of Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1,375,994	88,829	9,001	75	Campion
Berkshire Athenaeum, Pittsfield, Mass...	118,341	8,102	3,051	98	Treyz
Portland P. L., Portland, Maine....	171,688	10,389	2,194	75	Treyz
Libr. Assoc. of Portland, Oregon...	771,363	61,425	6,559	85	Piercy
Princeton P. L., Princeton, N.J.....	30,121	3,517	ca2,100	95	Pautzsch
Queens Borough P.L., Jamaica, N.Y.....	1,425,345	201,884	9,912	75	Pautzsch

APPENDIX H

Public Libraries, Including State and Regional (Cont.)

	1. Vols. in Lib.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4. % Am.	Interviewer
Richmond P. L., Richmond, Va.....	272,956	14,877	n.r.	?	Treyz
Rochester P. L., Rochester, N. Y...	558,323	67,860	8,646	80	Treyz
Sacramento City L., Sacramento, Cal...	376,481	14,026	3,218	100	Piercy
St. Louis Co. L., Normandy, Mo.....	363,834	83,166	5,359	75	Piercy
St. Louis P. L., St. Louis, Mo.....	1,125,075	62,218	6,860	92	Piercy
Schenectady Co. P. L., Schenectady, N.Y..	204,684	18,273	3,873	95	Treyz
Seattle P. L., Seattle, Wash.....	1,014,583	52,848	9,500	80	Piercy
Spokane P. L., Spokane, Wash.....	258,722	13,877	3,702	90	Piercy
Syracuse P. L., Syracuse, N. Y....	253,738	24,300	n.r.	90	Treyz
Toledo P. L., Toledo, Ohio.....	613,274	44,562	5,422	60	Campion
Urbana Free P. L., Urbana, Ill.....	50,000	2,750	2,600	99	Pautzsch
Virginia State Lib., Richmond, Va.....	428,060	10,488	3,315	40	Treyz
Washington State L., Olympia, Wash.....	466,335	11,832	ca5,000	85	Piercy
Weld Co. Lib., Greeley, Colo.....	49,974	5,878	2,226	95	Piercy
Wheaton P. L., Wheaton, Ill.....	33,759	2,829	n.r.	90	Pautzsch
Free P. L., Worcester, Mass...	505,776	25,837	4,222	95	Treyz
Martin Memorial L., York, Pa.....	73,192	3,706	n.r.	?	Campion

APPENDIX H

Special Libraries

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4% Am.	Interviewer
Air Univ. Library, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.	200,701	14,458	4,882	90	Drewry
Am. Philosophical Soc. Library, Phila.	110,000	1,185	850	30	Campion
Battelle Memorial Inst. Columbus, O.	54,977	5,894	3,549	62	Campion
Biddle Law Library, Phila. (Univ. of Pa.)	147,000	3,565	737	80	Campion
College of Physicians, Phila.	200,349	3,560	1,011	87	Campion
Colorado School of Mines, Golden.	ca90,000	1,555	cal,200	80	Piercy
E.I. DuPont DeNemours & Co., Wilmington...	19,300	3,046	n.r.	95	Campion
Engineering Societies Library, New York...	176,780	2,382	cal,700	66	Pautzsch
Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Library...	10,931	720	560	100	Treyz
Federal Reserve Bank of New York Library.	45,000	3,900	1,362	50	Pautzsch
Iliff School of Theology Lib., Denver..	45,000	2,450	ca2,000	60	Piercy
John Crerar Lib., Chicago.	650,000	5,400	2,560	30	Pautzsch
Linda Hall Library, Kansas City, Mo.	200,000/	10,730	4,100	50-	Piercy
Los Angeles Co. Law Lib., Los Angeles...	312,902	10,000	5,967	25	Piercy
Los Angeles Co. Medical Lib., Los Angeles	ca79,200	ca2,500	cal,700	85	Piercy
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Phila.	66,351	2,504	1,300	35	Campion
Malmstrom Air Force Lib., Great Falls...	11,826	1,722	1,600	90	Piercy
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.	138,500	3,931	2,808	?	Pautzsch

APPENDIX H

Special Libraries (Cont.)

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4% Am.	Interviewer
National Lib. of Medicine, Wash.....	953,765	19,989	15,005	7	Treyz
Newberry Library, Chicago, Ill.....	768,957	12,164	1,860	45	Pautzsch
Peabody Institute Lib., Baltimore.....	276,247	2,659	2,421	6	Piercy
Price Gilbert Mem. Lib. Ga. Inst. Tech., Atlanta.....	202,934	9,807	3,761	40	Drewry
Rohm & Haas Co., Phila.....	10,550	n.r.	ca 500	90	Campion
Smith Kline & French Labs., Phila.....	ca 8,500	900	450	65	Campion
Sun Oil Co., Marcus Hook, Pa.....	9,312	754	375	20	Campion
Time, Inc., Bur. of Editorial Ref., New York.....	39,000	2,000	1,800	85	Pautzsch
TVA Technical Lib., Knoxville, Tenn.....	52,300	1,471	n.r.	95	Drewry
Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, O.....	16,000	628/	489/	26	Campion
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Wash.....	1,150,000	19,767	9,451	25	Treyz
U.S. Dept. Health, Ed. & Welfare, Wash.....	700,000	12,000	11,134	90	Treyz
William Stanley Lib., Genl. Elec. Co. Pittsfield, Mass....	20,252	737	272	95	Treyz

APPENDIX H

School Systems with Centralized Processing

	1. Vols.	2. Vols. added	3. New titles	4% Am.	Interviewer
Baltimore. School Lib. Dept.....	510,000*	17,241	14,149	50-	Piercy
Columbus, Ohio. Public Schools.....	243,031*	34,420	2,151	98	Campion
Dade Co., Fla. Central Catg. Dept. Bd. of Ed.....	83,591*	39,635	4,957	6	Drewry
Dearborn, Mich. Dept. School Libs.....	268,211*	22,294	n.r.	100	Campion
Denver, Colo. Dept. of Schools, Dept. Lib. Science.....	153,533*	ca2,400	ca1,000	90-95	Piercy
Los Angeles. City Schools. Library Sect.....	3,924,000	310,000	ca14,000	75	Piercy
Madison, Wisc. School Lib. Dept.....	147,351*	15,517	1,890	95	Pautzsch
Nashville, Tenn. School Lib. Div., Pub. School.....	149,173*	7,974	n.r.	?	Drewry

*Figures only for those books centrally processed--only a part of the Schools.

II. Library and Other Visits Made Without Use of Questionnaires

Schools

Albuquerque High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico (Piercy)
Atlanta City Schools, Area 3, Atlanta, Ga. (Interviewed Supervisor) (Drewry)
Branford High School, Branford, Conn. (Treyz)
Cohn High School, Nashville, Tenn. (Drewry)
Hallahan Girls High School, Philadelphia. (Campion)
Hamden High School, Hamden, Conn. (Treyz)

APPENDIX H

Schools (Cont.)

Henry Clay High School, Lexington, Ky. (Drewry)
Hillhouse High School, New Haven, Conn. (Treyz)
Jamaica High School, Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y. (Pautzsch)
Leon County Schools (conference 8 school librarians) Tallahassee, Fla. (Drewry)
New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Library Service (Conf. with Supervisor) (Pautzsch)
Norman Junior High School, Norman, Oklahoma. (Piercy)
Olney High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (Campion)
Robert E. Lee High School, Montgomery, Ala. (Drewry)
St. Anthony's of Padua, Baltimore, Md. (Piercy)
St. Mary's Elementary School, Baltimore, Md. (Piercy)
St. Mary's High School, New Haven, Conn. (Treyz)
Seattle School System, Centralized Processing (Interview with Cataloger) (Piercy)
South Bend Elementary School, Miami Beach, Fla. (Drewry)
University High School (L.S.U. campus) Baton Rouge, La. (Drewry)
Wingate High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (Pautzsch)

Special Libraries

Art Institute of Chicago, Ill. (Pautzsch)
Curtis Publishing Research Dept., Philadelphia. (Campion)
New York Historical Society Library, New York. (Pautzsch)

University

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex. (Piercy)
Washington State University, Pullman, Wash. (Piercy)
Montana State University, Missoula, Mont. (filled out questionnaire, not visited)

Bookstores and Firms Visited

R. R. Bowker & Co., New York. (Piercy)
Bro-Dart Industries, Newark, N. J. (Piercy)
Channel Bookstore, New Haven, Conn. (Treyz)
Cokesbury Bookstore, Atlanta, Ga. (Drewry)
Cokesbury Bookstore, Dallas, Tex. (Piercy)
Crescent Store, Book Department, Spokane, Wash. (Piercy)
Rich's, Inc., Book Department, Atlanta, Ga. (Drewry)
Rittenhouse Book Store, Philadelphia, Pa. (Campion)
Stechert-Hafner Co., New York, N. Y. (Pautzsch)
H. W. Wilson Co., N. Y. (Piercy)
Yale Co-op Book Store, New Haven, Conn. (Treyz)

APPENDIX I

Sources of Bibliographic Information for Ordering.

Explanation:

Categories which libraries were asked to rate 1-12, 1 the highest.

Total score, found by weighted multiplication (12 points for rating 1, 3 points for rating 10, 0 for those not checked at all, etc.)

Rank of importance for this group.

Universities and Colleges (75)

	Categories	Score	Rank
1.	Trade bibliographies	855	1
2.	Reviewing media	668	2
3.	Publishers' announcements	655	5
4.	Bookstore lists	222	9
5.	Dealer or jobber lists	320	8
6.	2d-hand dealer lists	665	4
7.	Salesmen	175	10
8.	Book exhibits	115	12
9.	Automatic receipts	555	6
10.	Citations in books, etc	376	7
11.	Recommendations of individuals	668	3
12.	Other	171	11

Public and State Libraries and Regional Centers (73)

	Categories	Score	Rank
1.	Trade bibliographies	789	2
2.	Reviewing media	842	1
3.	Publishers' announcements	669	3
4.	Bookstore lists	203	11
5.	Dealer or jobber lists	328	9
6.	2d-hand dealer lists	385	7
7.	Salesmen	359	8
8.	Book exhibits	210	10
9.	Automatic receipts	522	4
10.	Citations in books, etc	464	6
11.	Recommendations of individuals	500	5
12.	Other	87	12

APPENDIX I

Sources of Bibliographic Information for Ordering. (Cont.)

Special Libraries (31)

	Categories	Score	Rank
1.	Trade bibliographies	283	3
2.	Reviewing media	298	2
3.	Publishers' announcements	334	1
4.	Bookstore lists	142	8
5.	Dealer or jobber lists	124	9
6.	2d-hand dealer lists	183	7
7.	Salesmen	78	10
8.	Book exhibits	73	11
9.	Automatic receipts	232	5
10.	Citations in books, etc	227	6
11.	Recommendations of individuals	262	4
12.	Other	60	12

School Systems (8)

	Categories	Score	Rank
1.	Trade bibliographies	73	2
2.	Reviewing media	93	1
3.	Publishers' announcements	31	7
4.	Bookstore lists	13	11
5.	Dealer or jobber lists	24	9
6.	2d-hand dealer lists	8	12
7.	Salesmen	38	6
8.	Book exhibits	44	4
9.	Automatic receipts	30	8
10.	Citations in books, etc	48	3
11.	Recommendations of individuals	42	5
12.	Other	20	10

"Other" included special news stories, special projects, special purchases (e.g. whole libraries), LC proof sheets, visits to bookstores, requests for quotations from dealers, bibliographic centers, Wilson cards received on standing order, radio and TV reviews (e.g. from a university station), special lists, and interlibrary loan requests.

APPENDIX J

CATALOGING IN SOURCE

Consumer Reaction Survey

Information To Be Assembled For The Interviewer

Date: _____

I. Background Information

A. Name of Library or Processing Center: _____

Location: _____

B. Statistics for library or library system for which processing is done:

1. Total number of volumes at beginning of current year (1959 or fiscal 1958/59): _____

2. Number of volumes (including all copies, also bound volumes of serials) added to cataloged collection last year: _____

3. Number of new titles (including new editions) cataloged last year: _____
Approximate percentage of these which were current (1957-58) American imprints: _____

C. Organization for processing (including ordering, cataloging, book preparation, card preparation, filing, binding, and serials work but not including book selection, photoduplicating or circulation)

1. Do you process books for adult use? Yes_____ No_____

2. Do you process books for juvenile use? Yes_____ No_____

3. Approximate number of professional hours spent on processing per week: _____

4. Approximate number of non-professional hours spent on processing per week: _____

5. Agencies served: (Check one only of a-e)

a. One single central library collection only: _____

b. One central library composed of 2 or more separate departments:
   (1) Number of such departments _____
   (2) Number of such departments with their own catalogs and/or shelf-lists _____

c. Central library of one collection plus branch agencies or departments:
   (1) Number of branches or departments _____
   (2) Number of branches with their own catalogs and/or shelf-lists _____

d. Central departmentalized library plus branch agencies or departments;
   (1) Number of departments in central library _____
   (2) Number of these departments with their own catalogs and/or shelf-list _____
   (3) Number of branch agencies or departments _____
   (4) Number of these agencies with their own catalogs and/or shelf-lists _____

e. Several separate agencies with no central collection:
   (1) Number of agencies _____
   (2) Number of agencies with their own catalogs and/or shelf-lists _____

f. Is <u>all</u> processing work for these agencies(a-e) above done by a central department or processing center? _____

g. If not, please identify areas of work done by agencies themselves rather than by central department or processing center _____

_____

_____

II. Acquisitions:

A. Estimate to the nearest ten percent the percentage of orders placed for your library system (exclusive of standing orders)

1. Before publication date: _____

2. After publication date: _____

APPENDIX J

B. Rank in the order of their importance to your system all of the following sources of bibliographic information used in acquiring American publications (1-most important or useful: 12-least important or useful. If two or more sources are equally important, assign the same rank to each:

Rank

1. Trade and national bibliographies (Publisher's Weekly, CBI, Government indexes, etc.) _____

2. Reviewing media (Library Journal, Saturday Review, Kirkus, newspapers, magazines) _____

3. Individual publishers' announcements, ads and catalogs of current publications. _____

4. Bookstore lists of current publications. _____

5. Dealer or jobber lists. _____

6. Second-hand dealers' catalogs and lists. _____

7. Salesmen. _____

8. Book exhibits. _____

9. Automatic receipts (including unsolicited gifts, exchanges, blanket orders, memberships, etc.) _____

10. Citations in other books and in periodicals (other than advertisements) _____

11. Recommendations from individuals (patrons, faculty, students, library staff members, etc.) _____

12. Other sources (please specify) _____ _____

_____

_____

C. Responsibility for searching library records prior to ordering materials or adding gift materials is assigned to (please check all that apply, and if more than one agency is responsible, rank in order of relative responsibility, 1-greatest responsibility): Rank (if needed)

1. Acquisitions department or personnel, including any special or separate searching or bibliography unit _____

2. Catalog department or personnel. _____

APPENDIX J

3. Reference or other subject departments or personnel._____

4. Branch, or agency librarians. _____

5. The librarian (or chief professional officer in a library organization) _____

6. Faculty members. _____

7. Other (please specify)_____ _____

_____

D. Bibliographical information assembled in the course of ordering materials is made available to the Cataloging department or unit:

Yes_____No_____

III. Preparation of Catalog Cards.

A. Source of cards:
In the following table, please check the appropriate box to indicate the approximate percentage of catalog cards used in your system and obtained from each of the specified sources:
(The sum of 1-7 should equal 100)

	Est. Percentage									
	10 or less	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Catalog Cards Purchased 1. From Library of Congress										
2. From H. W. Wilson Company										
3. From Alanar										
4. From other sources (specify) _____ _____										
Catalog Cards Prepared Locally: 5. From Library of Congress copy										
6. From Wilson Standard Catalog series										
7. Without LC, Wilson, or other cards or copy (i.e. original cataloging)										

B. Catalog Cards Purchased:

1. If catalog cards are purchased from LC, Wilson, Alanar, or other sources, please check any of the following which apply to your system:

   a. They are used without any changes in the data provided. _____

   b. They are adapted to fit the edition in hand. _____

   c. They are changed or adapted to accord with some local custom or variation, e.g., to substitute copyright for imprint date, change subject headings, add extra notes, modify entry, etc. _____
   If possible, please estimate the percentage of titles changed. _____

   d. They are purchased, if possible, with subjects, titles, and added-entry headings pre-printed. _____

   e. Subjects, titles, and added-entry headings usually are added to the cards by the processing unit. _____

   f. In library system, subjects, titles, and added-entry headings are added to the cards by the using agency or branch. _____

2. If Library of Congress cards are purchased, please rank in order of importance to your system, the following sources of information for ordering LC cards, 1 highest, 8 least) Rank

   a. LC proof sheets. _____

   b. LC depository. _____

   c. LC printed catalogs (National Union Catalog, etc.) _____

   d. Trade bibliographies which include LC card numbers (PW, CBI, ALA Booklist, etc.)

   e. Catalog card numbers printed in the books themselves. _____

   f. The book itself (i.e., order placed by author and title rather than by card number) _____

   g. Standing orders for cards for titles in series, or ordered by group as analytics for a set, etc. _____

   h. Other sources (please specify) _____ _____

   _____

3. If H.W. Wilson cards are purchased, please check method of ordering these cards:

Rank

a. Selected titles from lists supplied by Wilson Co. _____

b. Standing order for all cards with headings preprinted _____

c. Standing order for all cards without headings preprinted _____

Catalog Cards Prepared Locally by Library or Processing Center.

1. In your library or processing center, those catalog cards which are locally prepared are:

Check one of a, b, or c.

a. Wholly typed (i.e., complete sets typed for all titles) _____

b. Duplicated by machine (i.e., complete sets are duplicated for all titles from copy prepared for main entry) _____

c. Partially typed and partially duplicated (i.e., sets requiring only a locally-prescribed minimum number of cards are wholly typed, other sets are duplicated) _____

2. If some or all of the catalog cards used in your library or library system are duplicated, please indicate which machine or method of card reproduction is used (including model number):

a. Addressograph. _____

b. Mimeograph. _____

c. Multilith. _____

d. Zerox and Multilith. _____

e. Other (Please specify) _____ _____

_____

3. If catalog cards are duplicated (check items of practice followed):

a. Call numbers are typed on in a separate operation. _____

b. Call numbers are reproduced on each card as a part of the duplicating operation. _____
If both a and b are checked, indicate categories of differentiation. _____

_____

_____

c. Titles, subject and added-entry headings are typed on in a separate operation. _____

d. Titles, subject and added entry headings are reproduced as a part of the duplicating operation. _____
If both c and d are checked, indicate catagories of differentiation: _____

4. For books carrying LC cataloging copy (i.e., Cataloging-in-Source), would you:

a. Order LC cards? Yes_____No _____

b. Order H.W. Wilson cards? Yes_____No _____

c. Order other printed cards? Yes_____No _____
Whose? _____

d. Hold publication until ordered cards came? Yes_____No _____

e. Catalog with temporary cards until ordered cards came? Yes_____No_____

f. Make your own catalog cards? Yes_____No _____

5. If Cataloging-in-source were available for seventy-five percent of American imprints, what changes, if any, would you make in your present methods of card preparation?

_____

_____

6. When additional catalog cards or sets of catalog cards are needed for titles new to one of the agencies or branches in your system but not new to the library system, they are:

a. Purchased from LC, Wilson, or other card supplying agency. _____

b. Wholly typed locally. _____

c. Wholly duplicated by machine locally from new stencils, mats, or plates. _____

d. Wholly duplicated by machine locally from stencils, mats, or plates retained on file. _____

e. Partially typed, partially duplicated depending upon number of cards needed, when duplicated from new stencils or mats. _____

f. Partially typed, partially duplicated depending upon number of cards needed, when duplicated from stored stencils or mats. _____

Time Required for Preparing Catalog Cards for Titles New to the Library System.

1. If catalog cards are purchased, please check the appropriate percentage in the table below for each of the items:

	Percentage						
	None	Less than 10	11-25	26-50	51-70	71-90	More than 90
a. Cards are available when book reaches cataloger							
b. Books are held until cards are received							
c. Books are released with temp.cards							
d. Books are cataloged without waiting for cards							

If catalog cards are prepared by the library system from LC or other copy:

a. Cards are made before book arrives							
b. Card copy is available with the book							
c. Books are held until copy is available							
d. Books are released with temp.cards							
e. Books cataloged without waiting for cataloging copy							

If books are held for purchased cards or for card copy (1b, or 2c), please indicate:

a. Maximum time held. _____days

b. Average time held. _____days

IV. Cataloging tools employed officially. Please check.

A. Classification scheme used:

1. Library of Congress _____
2. Dewey Decimal (specify edition) _____
3. Library of Congress (adapted) _____
4. Dewey Decimal (adapted) _____
5. Cutter Expansive _____
6. Universal Decima _____
7. Other (specify) _____ _____
8. If two or more systems are used in your system, please indicate distinctions in their use: _____

_____

_____

_____

9. Please enumerate any categories of material which are cataloged in your system but not classified: _____

_____

_____

B. Subject Headings authority:

1. Library of Congress _____
2. Sears _____
3. Smith _____
4. Rue _____

APPENDIX J

5. Other (specify)_____ _____

6. If two or more subject heading systems are used in your system, please specify distinctions_____

_____

_____

V. The questions in this section are designed to provide some measure by which the Consumer Reaction Survey can evaluate the applicability of current LC cataloging practices, as exhibited in Cataloging-in-Source data, to the current cataloging practices in other libraries. While the questions here raised are not intended to imply any change in LC practice, the findings may be indicative of modifications or alternatives to be considered in establishing a C-I-S program. Please attempt to answer these questions as carefully as possible. The questions are worded in an effort to establish some reasonably common frame of reference for your replies.

In the chart following, you are asked to record certain data with reference to your own cataloging operations. Please note that the chart is to be used for your answers to both questions A and C of this section.

A. Please check in the squares provided, that practice which is most often followed or which is established policy in your library or library system. Thus, for each item (1-17) one check will appear (a-h).

	Question A									Question C	
	a. Follow LC	b. Shorten form	c. Lengthen form	d. Completely different	e. Omit	f. Add	g. Decrease number	h. Increase number		Yes	No
1. Entry											
2. Title transcription											
3. Place of publication											
4. Publisher											
5. Date of Publication											
6. Paging or volume no.											
7. Illus. material											
8. Size											
9. Series note											
10. Contents note											
11. Bibliography note											
12. Other notes											
13. Classification											
14. Book or Work number											
15. Subject headings											
16. Title entries											
17. Other added entries											

If, in your library system, any significant or consistent deviation from LC cataloging practice is observed, please check below, or add others in the space provided. Please add any explanatory comments if you think they are needed.

1. Pseudonyms preferred to real names when pseudonym is "better-known" according to local judgment. _____
2. Pseudonyms are used for current fiction. _____
3. Personal name entries preferred to names of societies, institutions, etc. _____
4. Titles are abridged or abbreviated as much as possible in the body of the entry. _____
5. Place and Publisher omitted for fiction. _____
6. Publisher omitted. _____
7. Place omitted. _____
8. Place and Publisher omitted for juvenile books. _____
9. Copyright date always preferred to imprint date. _____
10. Paging limited to arabic numeral paging only. _____
11. Illustrative material limited to "illus." _____
12. Illustrative material not recorded or described. _____
13. Size omitted. _____
14. Size omitted except for outsize (over or under certain size). _____
15. Title entries always made. _____
16. Contents notes used more freely than LC does. _____
17. Other usual local variations (please list or explain). _____

_____

_____

In the table on page 11, please check either Yes or No in the right-hand columns for each of the items to indicate for which ones you could or would change local variations to agree with LC practice for the sake of bibliographic standardization.

If you do not believe that you could always accept the LC practice in form of entry (item 1 in the preceding table), please enumerate here the particular types of exceptions to LC entry which you would continue to use in your library system:

_____

APPENDIX J

VI. Cataloging practices for libraries not now using LC cards or copy.

A. General effect of having LC copy in the books.

For those books in which LC cataloging appears, would you:

1. Buy Wilson cards for all? Yes_____No_____
2. Buy Wilson cards for certain categories? Yes_____No_____
   Please specify: _____

_____

3. Order LC cards for all? Yes_____No_____
4. Order LC cards for certain categories?
   Please specify: _____ Yes_____No_____

_____

5. Obtain cards from other sources? Yes_____No_____

   Whose? _____

6. Prepare your own cards for all? Yes_____No_____
7. Prepare your own cards for certain categories? Yes_____No_____
   Please specify: _____

_____

B. Specific practices.

If you would prepare your own cards, please check the items of information you would be most likely to utilize as provided by the cataloged-in-source information:

Entry_____	Imprint date_____	Size_____
Title transcription___	Copyright date_____	Series note_____
Place of publication__	Paging or volumning_____	Contents note_____
Publisher_____	Illustrative information___	Bibliography note___
Other notes_____	Subject headings_____	
Classification_____	Title added entries_____	
Work number_____	Other added entries_____	

APPENDIX J

VII. Opinions and conclusions. (To discuss with staff and formulate answers).

A. It is hoped that Cataloging-in-Source would help libraries and their users by (a) getting new books to readers faster, (b) cutting the present high cost of cataloging, and (c) providing greater standardization in the identification of books.

B. With the above goals in mind, in your opinion will Cataloging-in-Source:

1. Affect your Library's book selection procedures (both in regard to acquisitions and in direct work with the patron)? How?

2. Affect your Library's acquisitions work? How?

3. Affect your Library's reference and bibliographic work? How?

APPENDIX J

4. Affect your cataloging procedures and practices? How?

5. Affect other areas of your Library's work? How?

6. Change staff assignments, e.g. from professional to non-professional? Which ones?

7. Eliminate machines or equipment used at present? Which ones?

8. Create the need for new machines or equipment? What kinds?

9. Eliminate any library tools used at present? Which ones?

APPENDIX J

10. Create the need for new tools? What kinds?

11. Affect inter-library relationships, (e.g. the combining of libraries into library systems, centralized or cooperative cataloging or processing, library deposits, inter-library loans, union catalogs, etc.)? What relationships? How?

APPENDIX J

12. If a new kind of copying machine (e.g. inexpensive -- under $500 -- portable, dry-process, which reproduced postive copy directly on catalog cards and capable of reducing or enlarging copy) were available, what would that mean in relation to questions B.1-11 above?

13. In summary, do you favor Cataloging-in-Source? _____

APPENDIX K

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

PROCESSING DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Dear

Re: Library of Congress
Cataloging in Source Project
Consumer Reaction Survey

We are delighted that you have agreed to take part in the Cataloging in Source reaction survey.

Below is the name of the member of the Consultant group who will be visiting your library. The visits will be made between March 15 and the end of May, and you will be hearing from your Interviewer very soon concerning a definite date.

Enclosed are two copies of the Information sheets, one for the Interviewer to keep after going over it with you, the other for your own use. We are advising that as much of the information as possible be filled in ahead to save time during the visit. But please keep the papers and data until the Consultant arrives.

We hope that the size of the document will not be overwhelming at first glance. Probably no library will need to answer all questions. Because we wanted to have one outline for libraries of all kinds and sizes, provisions for the variations resulted in considerable detail. But it is detail we need.

The 1,000 titles cataloged by the Library of Congress during the experimental period were not enough to give any library enough of them to have felt the influences. Also, in order to obtain publisher cooperation on this trial basis, LC had to permit the publishers to locate the information anywhere convenient and to set it in any style or size of type. Therefore we must put ourselves in the position of imagining that the majority of books will be arriving fully cataloged and then guess at the influences. In order to do that we must review each library's present procedures to locate points where CIS might

have some effect; it also means seeking educated guesses and compiling all of the imaginative ideas suggested by librarians. Some of the questions are deliberately leading or suggestive to call possible implications to the attention of everyone concerned. Others which have not occurred to us will occur to you; these are what we want, too.

Our thinking in asking for specific information includes the following:

Background. We attempted to keep this to the minimum, but some information is needed to orient the Interviewer in the library's organization so he can talk intelligibly; also some information is needed in order to classify libraries for comparisons and groupings in preparing a report.

Acquisitions. One of the goals of CIS is that it will lead to more uniform bibliographic listing; in order to convince bibliographic publishers that such uniformity would be valuable, we must know how it is used. It is in book selection and order work where this might show up most quickly; therefore we need evidence from libraries as to its potential value and in which bibliographical sources it would be valuable -- this last to carry back to the publishers.

Preparation of Cards. It is in this area of work that the individual library may evaluate most decisively CIS influence. It is here where the saving of time and money in cataloging should show up, if there is any. How essential the Cataloger's Camera is to the full advantages of CIS remains to be determined, and some of these questions should give us an answer. Furthermore, the publishers of printed cards want some idea of the future of these services should CIS become generally available.

Tools Used and Cataloging Practices. This information is for the future; in case a Cataloging in Source operation were established, the planners would want to know what kind of cataloging would be most useful to the greatest number of libraries.

Opinions and Conclusions. The responses here are probably the heart of the whole survey. It is upon the ideas advanced and the reactions or interest stated that the future of the proposal rests. If librarians want Cataloging in Source enough and express their wishes clearly and emphatically enough, it will influence book publishers to cooperate, influence bibliographical publishers to conform, make a case for seeking financial backing, and make the dream a reality. If the reaction is negative or lukewarm, it will be

APPENDIX K

the end of the whole thing; but even that would be an achievement, for we would be laying a hundred-year-old ghost, and this particular idea need not be reviewed again for many years.

We hope that the libraries will find the experience of participating stimulating and worth-while; certainly those of us doing the interviewing are looking forward to visiting the libraries.

Sincerely yours,

Esther J. Piercy

Esther J. Piercy, Director
Consumer Reaction Survey
Cataloging in Source

Please address additional correspondence to me at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore 1, Maryland.

Consultant visiting your library will be:

APPENDIX L

February 12, 1959

To: The Editor

Enclosed is a release which we would like to get distributed as widely as possible. Since the whole future of the Cataloging-in-Source project will probably depend upon the reaction of librarians, we feel we are indirectly serving libraries by getting this word to them. Running it in your publication would be a great help.

Esther J. Piercy, Director
CIS Consumer Reaction Survey

APPENDIX L

Cataloging-in-Source Seeks Answers

The Library of Congress, under a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., is currently running an experiment in supplying cataloging information to be printed within books themselves. During the year of the experiment (July 1958 - July 1959) cataloging information is appearing in over 1000 titles being published by trade, religious, government, university, and society publishers.

As part of this testing project, the Library is eager to receive as much information as possible as to the reaction on the proposal. How would libraries use this information if it were made generally available and what effect would it have on their procedures and on their organization? Some 200 libraries of various sizes and kinds and locations have been selected for depth interviews by consultants working for LC on a Consumer Reaction Survey, but voluntary expressions are being sought from all interested libraries. Librarians are urged to write to the address below summarizing the reactions of their professional staffs to the ideas following.

It is hoped that books carrying their own cataloging information (being cataloged in source) would help libraries and their users by (a) getting new books to users faster (b) cutting the present high cost of cataloging, and (c) providing greater standardization in the identification of books. With

these goals in mind, what would Cataloging-in-Source mean to your Library? Might it:

(1) Affect your library's ordering procedures, book selection, reference, or bibliographical work (particularly if bibliographic publishers and all libraries used the same form of author and title entry)?

(2) Affect your library's methods of obtaining and preparing catalog cards?

(3) Simplify or complicate your library's work?

(4) Eliminate equipment or create need for new equipment?

(5) Affect inter-library relationships such as library systems, centralized or cooperative cataloging or processing, library deposits, inter-library loans, union catalogs?

For the sake of greater bibliographical standardization, would you be willing to adopt the LC form of author and title entries? Always, or with specific exceptions?

You are urged to get your opinions on record by sending them (favorable or unfavorable) to the Director of this CIS Consumer Reaction Survey:

Miss Esther J. Piercy
Enoch Pratt Free Library
Baltimore 1, Maryland

APPENDIX M

Meetings at Which Cataloging-in-Source Was Discussed

Maryland, Virginia and District of Columbia Catalogers.
November 1, 1958.

Philadelphia Area Technical Services Librarians.
February 24, 1959.

Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians.
Spring, 1959.

New York Technical Services Librarians.
April 10, 1959.

Oklahoma Library Association, Catalog Section.
April 10, 1959.

Northern California Technical Processes Group.
April 17, 1959.

Chicago Regional Group of Libraries in Technical Services.
April 20, 1959.

Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians.
April 24, 1959.

Los Angeles Regional Catalogers Group.
April 25, 1959.

Twin City Catalogers Round Table.
April 30, 1959.

New Jersey Library Association, Catalogers' Section.
May 1, 1959.

Nashville Catalogers.
May 7, 1959.

Ontario Regional Group of Cataloguers.
May 21, 1959.

APPENDIX M

Connecticut Library Association, Catalogers' and Classifiers' Section.
June 9, 1959.

ALA - RTSD Program Meeting at ALA Conference.
June 22, 1959.

Pacific Northwest Library Association, Catalog Section.
September 4, 1959.

Mountain Plains Library Association, Catalog Section.
October 8, 1959.

North Carolina Library Association, Catalog Section.
October 8, 1959.

Wisconsin Library Association, Cataloging Section.
October 13, 1959.

Michigan Library Association, General Session.
October 21, 1959.

New England Group of Medical Librarians.
October 30, 1959.

Ontario Regional Group of Cataloguers.
November 21, 1959.

APPENDIX N

Bibliography

A Chronological Description of the More Important Published Accounts of the Experiment

The exploratory survey by Andrew D. Osborn was briefly described in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, January 20, 1958 (p. 24-25). Mr. Osborn reported on his survey and Verner W. Clapp on the "cataloger's camera" in the Minutes of the 50th Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (p. 15-17).

The experiment proper was announced in the Library of Congress Press Release No. 58-69, June 26, 1958. This release was partially reproduced in the daily press, including the New York Times, June 27, 1958 (p. 21) and the Washington Post and Times Herald of the same date, (p. B 5). It also formed the basis of accounts in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, June 30, 1958 (p. 331-333), the Antiquarian Bookman, July 7-14, 1958 (p. 5), the Publishers' Weekly, July 7, 1958 (p. 63), the CU News of the General Library, University of California at Berkeley, July 10, 1958 (p. 2), the ALA Bulletin, September 1958 (p. 569), College and Research Libraries, September 1958 (p. 414), and Library Resources and Technical Services, Winter 1959 (p. 54-55).

The participation of the U. S. Bureau of the Census in the experiment was mentioned in its Census Bulletin, August 22, 1958 (p. 4) and that of the H. W. Wilson Co. in the Wilson Library Bulletin, September 1958 (p. 77). Margaret Lane described the experiment and noted the participation of the State of Louisiana in her "The National 'Cataloging-in-Source' Experiment," which appeared in the Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, Winter 1958 (p. 141-142). The grant was announced and the background of the experiment sketched in the 2nd Annual Report of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (p. 15-18). Richard H. Shoemaker's The Effect of Cataloging at the Source on the Princeton University Library (17 leaves) appeared in November 1958.

A preliminary list of publishers cooperating in the program appeared in Cataloging Service, Bulletin 48 and an expanded list in Bulletin 50. A progress report was published

APPENDIX N

in the Information Bulletin of the Director's Advisory Council of the Free Library of Philadelphia, November 14, 1958 (p. 1-2). In the ALA Bulletin, November 1958 (p. 738) a reader suggested printing the cataloging information on a perforated slip. That it be printed on the dust jacket was suggested in the New York Times Book Review, February 1, 1959 (p. 8). The completion of the cataloging phase of the experiment was noted in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, March 9, 1959 (p. 139-140) and a list of the titles cataloged appeared in Cataloging Service, Bulletin 52.

The role of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee as an advisory group for the Consumer Reaction Survey was mentioned in the Proceedings of the 77th Annual Conference of the American Library Association (p. 65). The appointment of the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey was noted in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, September 29, 1958 (p. 551). The first meeting of the interviewers with the director was described in the January 19, 1959 issue of the same publication (p. 34) and in the Library Journal, March 1, 1959 (p. 711).

The participation in the Consumer Reaction Survey of the General Library of the University of California at Berkeley was announced in its CU News, March 15, 1959 (p. 2) and a similar announcement, with a mention of some of the problems of Cataloging-in-Source, appeared in the Toledo (Ohio) Public Library's The Tee-Pee, March 16, 1959 (n. p.).

A large number of journals carried the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey's appeal for comments on the use which might be made of Cataloging-in-Source information. Among the publications with a national distribution were the ALA Bulletin, April 1959 (p. 329), Catholic Library World, April 1959 (p. 390), College and Research Libraries, May 1959 (p. 196), Library Journal, March 15, 1959 (p. 818), Library Resources and Technical Services, Spring 1959 (p. 152), Special Libraries May-June 1959 (p. 200), and Wilson Library Bulletin, April 1959 (p. 544-546). Other journals reprinting the request for information included the Spring 1959 issues of Hospital and Institution Book Guide, the Newsletter of the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center, the Illinois Association for School Librarian's News for You, the Bulletin of the Ohio Association for School Libraries, Indiana School Library Newsletter, Alabama School Library Bulletin, Florida State Library

APPENDIX N

Bulletin, the Bookmark of the New York State Library, Nebraska Newsletter to Libraries, South Dakota Library Bulletin, Oregon State Library Bulletin, California State Library Newsletter, the Missouri State Library's Show Me Librarian, and the Hawaii Library Association Journal.

The completion of the Consumer Reaction Survey was noted in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, June 8, 1959 (p. 319) and Arnold H. Trotier gave a good summary of the project in his "Cataloging-in-Source--The Story up to Now" which appeared in Illinois Libraries, June 1959 (p. 426-431).

The preliminary reports on Cataloging-in-Source given at the Washington conference of the American Library Association were summarized in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, July 6, 1959 (p. 395-396) and the Publishers' Weekly, July 13, 1959 (p. 32). They were reproduced in Library Resources and Technical Services, Fall 1959 (p. 239-256). Jane Kaser presented an excellent description of the experiment and its background in her "The Venerable History of Cataloging-in-Source," appearing in the Missouri Library Association Quarterly, September 1959 (p. 76-81). The drafting of the final report on Cataloging-in-Source was mentioned in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin, October 19, 1959 (p. 641).

Appendix M lists library association meetings at which Cataloging-in-Source was discussed. At most of these a member of the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee or of the Consumer Reaction Survey staff was present and read a paper. In a number of instances these papers were printed in the journals issued by the associations.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1960 O - 543224

cataloginginsour00libr
cataloginginsour00libr

cataloginginsour00libr